DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 335 744 EA 023 207

AUTHOR Silver, Harold
TITLE Education, Change and the Policy Process. Education Policy Perspectives Series.
REPORT NO ISBN-1-85000-699-7
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 240p.
AVAILABLE FROM Falmer Press, 1900 Frost Road, Suite 101, Bristol, PA 19007 ($25.00 plus $2.50 postage and handling).
PUB TYPE Books (010) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Historical Materials (060)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC10 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Strategies; *Educational History; Educational Improvement; *Educational Policy; Educational Practices; Educational Trends; Foreign Countries; Futures (of Society); Higher Education; History; *Policy Formation; Trend Analysis
IDENTIFIERS United Kingdom

ABSTRACT

The aim of this book is to track the historical elements of change in educational policy formation and implementation in relation to the specifics of responses to change, the possibilities of change, and attempts to achieve it. Chapter 1 assess whether the future is in past historical change or is simply illuminated by it. The notion of an explicit relationship between history and policy analysis is expounded in chapter 2. The answer for successful policy making in British higher education is looked for in chapter 3. Chapter 4 describes versions of accountability in public sectors of higher education. Chapter 5 delineates the decline in the reputation of British higher education from the mid-1960s to the 1980s. Chapter 6 places vocationalism in the context of further education, describing its intentions and outcomes. Chapter 7 contains a history of periods in British education from 1780 until now. Chapter 8 examines the American zeal for change in education as a historical process beginning in the 1980s. Chapter 9 describes the plight of socially disadvantaged children in school from 1920-80. Chapter 10 reinforces the general thrust of the book as a concern for using "historical policy analysis" as a point of entry into considerations for educational change. Notes at the end of each chapter and an index are provided. (EJS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED335744

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. Streisand

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 023 207

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Education, Change and the Policy Process

3

Education Policy Perspectives

General Editor: **Professor Ivor Goodson**, Faculty of Education, University of Western Ontario, London, Canada N6G 1G7

Private Schools and Public Policy:
International Perspectives
Edited by William Lowe Boyd and James G. Cibulka

Education Policies:
Controversies and Critiques
Edited by Andy Hargreaves and David Reynolds

Out of Place:
Public Policy and the Emergence of Truancy
Fiona M.S. Paterson

Making the School an Effective Community:
Belief, practice and Theory in School Administration
Mark Holmes and Edward A. Wynne

Flunking Grades:
Research and Policies on Retention
Edited by Lorrie A. Shepard and Mary Lee Smith

Successful Secondary Schools:
Visions of Excellence in American Public Education
Bruce L. Wilson and Thomas B. Corcoran

Educational Policy in Australia and America:
Comparative Perspectives
Edited by William Lowe Boyd and Don Smart

Federal Aid to the Disadvantaged:
What Future for Chapter 1?
Edited by Denis P. Doyle and Bruce S. Cooper

The Politics of Excellence and Choice in Education
Edited by William Lowe Boyd and Charles Taylor Kercher

The Politics of Reforming School Administration
Edited by Jane Hannaway and Robert Crowson

Education Policy Perspectives

Education, Change and the Policy Process

Harold Silver

The Falmer Press
(A member of the Taylor & Francis Group)
London • New York • Philadelphia

5

UK The Falmer Press, Falmer House, Barcombe, Lewes, Sussex, BN8 5DL

USA The Falmer Press, Taylor & Francis Inc., 242 Cherry St Philadelphia, PA 19106–1906

© 1990 Harold Silver

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without permission in writing from the Publisher.

First published 1990

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Silver, Harold.
Education, change, and the policy process/
Harold Silver.
p. cm. — (Education Policy Perspectives)
ISBN 1–85000–698–9: — ISBN
1–85000–699–7 (pbk.):
1. Education and state — Great Britain — History.
2. Higher education and state — Great Britain —
History. I. Title. II. Series.
LC93.G7S48 1990
379.41 — dc20 89–29150
CIP

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Silver, Harold, *1928–*
Education change and the policy process —
(Education Policy Perspectives)
1. Education. Reform, history
I. Title II. Series
370'.9

ISBN 1–85000–698–9
ISBN 1–85000–699–7 pbk

Contents

Acknowledgments		vii
Introduction		1
Chapter 1	Is There a Future in the Past?	5
Chapter 2	Historian in a Policy Field: A British Chef in Paris?	19
Chapter 3	The Escaping Answer	34
Chapter 4	Public Sectors of Higher Education: Versions of Accountability	58
Chapter 5	From Great Expectations to Bleak Houses	79
Chapter 6	Intentions and Outcomes: Vocationalism in Further Education	100
Chapter 7	Britain's Educational Worlds	147
Chapter 8	Zeal as a Historical Process: The American View from the 1980s	166
Chapter 9	Socially Disadvantaged Children in School, 1920–80	189
Chapter 10	Policy Problems in Time	211
Index		224

7

Acknowledgments

I would like in particular to thank the Nuffield Foundation, which enabled me, in 1980/81, to begin to take a serious interest in the relationship between history and policy studies, and later for funding the research which resulted in the chapter entitled 'The escaping answer', which was co-authored with Pamela Silver. This interest in 'historical policy studies' led to the choice of that focus for a number of conference papers and articles which in a revised form are contained in this book. Many of these were drafted for, and were the subject of, discussion in various places: 'Is there a future in the past?' at the Australia and New Zealand History of Education Society; 'Public sectors of higher education' at the History of Education Society in Britain; 'Socially disadvantaged children in school 1920–1980' at an Anglo-Scandinavian conference on historical perspectives on childhood sponsored by the Norwegian Centre for Child Research, University of Trondheim; 'Policy problems in time' at the Canadian History of Education Association. I am grateful to those who took part in these meetings, and to those who discussed these and related themes at seminars in Canada, at the universities of Western Ontario, London; Dalhousie, Nova Scotia; Alberta, Edmonton; in Australia at Western Australia, Murdoch, Adelaide, Flinders, Monash, Wollongong and Sydney universities; in the United States at Pennsylvania State University, Centre for the Study of Higher Education.

Versions of some of these chapters have appeared in publications as follows: 'Historian in a policy field' in the Australian *History of Education Review*; 'The escaping answer' in Moodie G.C. (Ed.) *Standards and Criteria in Higher Education* (SRHE-Nelson); 'Public sectors of higher education' in Cunningham P. (Ed.) *International Currents in Educational Ideas and Practices* (History of Education Society); 'From great expectations to bleak houses' in *Higher Education Quarterly*; 'Zeal as a historical process' in *History of Education*, and 'Britain's educational worlds' in *Lock*

Acknowledgments

Haven International Review. 'Intentions and outcomes' was written for, and published by, the Further Education Unit, which supported the research.

Harold Silver
Oxford
December 1989

Introduction

History is the recording and analysis of change — when, how and why it took place, or didn't. Historians are not alone in their pursuit — being joined by anthropologists, evaluators, economists and — at times — most social and political scientists. Historians are alone, however, in having the broad processes and detailed accounting of and for change and its absence as their entire occupation. Selecting from and giving real or apparent coherence to the human record is their sole mission. In doing so they join their other social and political science and other partners in imposing order on detail, employing concepts which organize their data, bounding their sequences and selections with the limitations and opportunities of theory and contributing back to it, and using or explicitly formulating strategies of understanding and explanation. Historians of education, whether it is characterized by late twentieth-century conservatism or early nineteenth-century radicalism, whether it is framed by industrialism or monasticism, whether it is structured in the grammar school curriculum of the sixteenth century or the university curriculum of the nineteenth century, share the same concerns, intentions and difficulties.

The aim here is not specifically to theorize about historical change in general or in relation to education, or to review the literature of change. Nor is it the aim to diagnose pervasive elements of educational change — though it will be clear from what follows that such wider diagnosis is never far from the individual record and attempted explanation. The essential purpose is to put historical tools to work on some contemporary and recent educational phenomena. The incentive in all cases is an interest in penetrating current debate and policy, the processes, practices and vocabularies in which they are embodied, and which they reflect and engender. The aim is to track elements of change in the broad domain of educational policy formulation and implementation, alongside and in relation to the specifics of engagement in responses to change and the possibilities of change, and attempts to achieve it.

The essential problem in depicting and analyzing change lies in the complex realities which shape and constitute it, and in the infinite gradations of pace and magnitude in which it takes place. The discussions which follow cover, for example, the slow shifts in the meaning of standards in higher education in this century, changing patterns of higher education in Britain and the United States, interpretations of post-secondary vocational education, and policies relating to disadvantaged children in school. They cover such moments of rapid change as the designation of new institutions or the rapid emergence of a new emphasis in public policy. Change is 'internalist' and 'externalist', policy-driven and policy-resistant, in contexts of conservative reform as well as radical and liberal reform. It is a feature of and affects 'education' variously conceived — within the strict definition of institutional structures and processes, within the wider relationships with work and preparation for work, within the wider politics of decision-making, social tensions and the culture which it may be seen to reflect, and to which it may contribute or be coterminous.

One of the constant problems therefore with any study of relationships between 'education' and aspects of 'society' is the uncertain interpretation of both. Following discussions from the 1960s in the United States around the need to broaden or redefine the interpretation of 'education', Lawrence Cremin, himself one of the initiators of the debates, reconstructed the history of American education around three substantive phases of American experience, which he defined as colonial, national and metropolitan. His portraits embraced the changing practices of family and workplace, church and mission, the press and publishing, salient features of rural and urban life. These were not 'incorporated' into an otherwise established picture of education in or as school and college — they *became* the picture. Evangelical and fundamentalist religion, radio and television, earned equal, or often superior, emphasis to the classroom, the curriculum, teacher education or the institutions of post-secondary education. Cremin's mission was to redefine the concept of education itself, in the telling and in the theory. Also from the 1960s, internationally, education was being redefined or remodelled in current practice from other directions. Paulo Freire was attempting to radicalize the process. Ivan Illich was attempting to deschool it. Adult and continuing education were not only expanding, but also changing shape in response to changing demand, changing opportunities, changing social and economic conditions. Education was being either restructured from above or adapting from below in response to unemployment and economic competition, the computer and the technology of distance learning, community action and pressures for civil and democratic rights.

As a result, new emphasis on and approaches to the 'world of work' began to influence school curricula and confuse decades-old distinctions

between education and training. Front-line concepts battled for recognition and action, appeared and disappeared, changed in significance. Priority moved from 'access' to 'excellence' or 'standards', from 'liberal' to more 'vocational' messages. Education moved into different degrees of overt relationship to politics and power, economic or moral revivalism. It became a strategic element of racial and gender politics. Discussion of education had become a discussion of elites and culture, language and social relations, economic and moral values, social class and social control, new technologies and essential skills. The boundaries of 'education', 'educators' and 'educationists' were increasingly difficult to perceive.

The difficulties involved in approaching the recent past are not, of course, fundamentally new. Historians of the nineteenth-century Sunday school or mechanics' institute, of the beginnings of mass education in the late eighteenth century or of the expansion of secondary or post-primary education in the early twentieth century, have not found it easy to map with certainty the nature of 'reform', the central elements of the motivation of providers, or the differences between intention, practice and effect. They have, like all historians, had difficulties with the concepts of social class and social control. They have failed to make substantial connections between the social history of the classroom — which in Britain and the United States remains desperately weak — and the grand historical designs of political and economic theorists — which, on a large scale in the United States and a smaller scale in Britain, remain desperately speculative. Historians have persistently rediscovered that established accounts of the educational past have misrepresented, under-presented or ignored some of the vital actors — children, girls, teachers, parents, communities. Redesigning the patterns has brought the history of education closer to sociology and politics, classroom research and evaluation, and social science concerns about methodology and theory in general. Recognition of the continuing and pervasive presence of the conceptual and organizational difficulties of historical analysis has — especially in the United States — been accompanied by attention to policy processes, to government and law, to education conceived with the breadth necessary to understand more deeply how societies shape and reshape their education and for what purposes. The frameworks of analysis have extended to the history of childhood and adolescence, family and employment, gender and race relations. In these directions of attention history has become deeply involved with changing and often profoundly controversial concepts and vocabularies — disadvantage and privilege, success and failure, teaching and learning, higher education and pre-school, selection and inequality. If history intends to reconstruct and explain the features of change and continuity, its own concepts, theories and methodologies are subject to change and continuity.

12

What follows in this book is a diverse attempt to represent some of these processes of recent change, all of which raise — here with varying degrees of explicitness — questions which are methodological, ideological and theoretical. To relate history to policy, to research, or to the growth of institutions or sectors, is to search for understandings of experience in dialogue with understandings of social processes. Such attempts have aroused considerable passions in the historiographies of recent decades, particularly at the level of theories of the corporate state, governing elites and education in the structures of power under capitalism. Those theories have left open questions of the nature of educational experience, the ways in which education may serve to reproduce social structures, how schooling limits or extends opportunities for individual development and mobility. Despite belated efforts to the contrary, grand theory — even when it has 'used' history as evidence — has tended to see schools as *mere* mirrors of society, operating on its behalf, reducing both teachers and taught to puppets or victims of the controlling mechanisms of the capitalist state, of class power and control. Such theories have been historically highly selective, have seen change as almost inevitably a form of adaptation to allow the exercise of greater, perhaps more subtle, power and control. Historical motivation has often been oversimplified in the process. Limited, tentative historical research has often been seized upon to buttress grand theoretical argument. Theoretical rhetoric has often been translated into historical certainties with little or no attention to the availability of supporting historical data. Despite, or perhaps even because of, such difficulties, in attempting to turn the stubborn confusions of the recent past into manageable shape it is necessary, however obliquely, to theorize. Theories, concepts, shapes, are themselves manageable only in intimate collaboration with the often indistinct or controversial but always essential process of attempting to discover how, in relationships and institutions, communities and societies, we came in distant and recent pasts to be where we are, and can have some hope of knowing where we might go.

Chapter 1

Is There a Future in the Past?

Formulated in this way, the question is two questions, both of which address the nature of historical change, and in particular as related to the emergence in the recent past of increased academic interest in the processes of public policy-making. Does the exercise of history itself have a future? Does it illuminate the future? The emphasis here is on the latter question, but the former is not unimportant. What history *is*, and how it is defensible, are questions never settled once and for all, to the satisfaction of its proponents and its critics. The faults do not all lie outside the community of historians. Historians are not always where they might or should be. Their exclusiveness and almost infinite sub-divisibility raise important difficulties. Social and political scientists often face two history-related problems — without necessarily articulating them. First, they have themselves to enter complex historical territory — particularly in recent history — often because historians are coy about entering it. Secondly, they use with confidence the descriptions and interpretations presented by historians. In both cases the confidence may be strident and may be rapidly shown to have been misplaced. Historians, forgetting the importance of doubt and the question mark, may encourage sociologists, economists and others to do likewise, and may share with them either a mythology of indestructable data, or a deterministic ideology, or both.

At this point in the contemporary historiography of education, the relationship between history and policy research, analysis and study is one of the key terrains on which such questions arise and have to be confronted. Alice Rivlin, in a discussion of higher education policy in the United States from the 1960s to the 1980s, makes the interesting assertion that

> The first characteristic of policy-making is the need for a crisis. In higher education, as in other areas of public policy, the American political system seems unable to engage in a serious debate about

> policy change — let alone to undertake action — unless some form of doom is widely felt to be impending . . . The requirement for a crisis before taking action is certainly not unique to higher education.[1]

For good historical reasons that may be *more* true of the United States than other countries with, among other things, a stronger and more permanent tradition of central government concern with the process that leads from debate to policy and to the hope or anticipation of action and change. The relationship between policy interests and crisis may, however, be international in character, and may be becoming increasingly visible in the conditions of the late twentieth century. Rivlin's emphasis may be tenable, however, only if policy and crisis are defined in fairly broad terms. The association between policy research and analysis on the one hand, and public problem solving on the other hand, explains both the direction of much work in the social and political sciences since the early 1960s and the reluctance of many historians to enter the territory. Applied history, history pressed into service perhaps for the wrong reasons and outcomes, is not what most historians of education wish to be detected doing. Telling truth to power, in another formulation,[2] would seem to involve historians in a risky relationship. The description could prove to be a euphemism for supping with the devil.

For those and other reasons to which we shall return, historical policy research has been largely neglected territory,[3] or somewhat superficial. It has not learned how to relate to the developing body of policy scholarship. The position with regard to history and policy — or for that matter the concept of planning also — in the 1980s has been not unlike the relationship with evaluation in the 1970s. They are all centrally concerned with processes of change. The evaluation movement had to produce its own historiography because historians did not see its 'judgmental' basis as relating to their own endeavours. The historical orientations of policy analysis have had to be invented within the policy enterprise — or more frequently such orientations have not informed the policy enterprise either for lack of interest on the part of historians, or because of anti-historical assumptions or suspicions by policy scholars wedded to certain kinds of abstraction, model and formula. The estrangement is profoundly unsatisfactory. In an area of scholarship like policy, where the central interest — regardless of purpose — is in the nature of change, in terms of formation and formulation, planning and decision-making, implementation and adaptation, and the evaluation of 'success' and 'failure', the absence of sustained historical input is extremely difficult to justify. That, however, is in itself purely a rhetorical and superficial beginning of an argument. It

could be taken to suggest merely that historians of the here-and-now, or of the there-and-then, need to serve as helpers at the base camp, from which the intrepid policy explorers will set out to scale the mountainous heights of public crisis in order better to glimpse the future on the other side. The argument begins, in fact, elsewhere.

There are several points that need to be underlined about historical scholarship. First, it is about the future in important ways. It is future-oriented in its methodology. Historians, like all analysts of social processes, assert or imply an interpretation of reality, a way of conducting the investigation, that they wish to project into an indefinite future, one that will serve at least until some next alternative. It is either an assertion or an invitation to dialogue, or something between the two, with a view to giving direction. This is true of the research paper, the book, teaching, the conference paper. Historians trade interpretations which in some way address conceptions of the future. Secondly, therefore, history is also substantively about the future, in ways of which historians are not likely normally to be aware in the act of doing history. The ways in which historical material is ordered, the messages it is induced to carry, tell us not only how the historian perceives a reality but how it is possible to perceive it. The processes point towards a somewhere, towards choices. The very vocabularies in which historians encapsulate their realities have some kind of intended immortality. Historians are not dealing solely in selected data, they are dealing in abstractions also.

The history of social processes like education is about, let us say, relationships (of communication, power, exploitation, consensus, cooperation, competition ...); about structures, which are formed by those relationships, and which impact upon them; and about concepts, generalizations, theories, without which neither the historian nor anyone else can arrive at graspable forms and understandings. Without abstractions like Renaissance or modernization, industrialism or bureaucracy, teaching or professionalism, adolescence or liberal education, and school and education themselves, there would not have been, or be, such history. That these vocabularies endure, change meanings, become controversial, are eclipsed, is just one of the complicated but necessary features of the historian's attention to the elusive concepts in which relationships and structures have to be addressed.

History is inevitably, therefore, theoretical, in ways which have been at the heart of confusion and controversy about the intersections between history and theory, not least in some of the Marxist debates of the past couple of decades. American revisionist historiography from the 1960s provoked consideration of the means of enquiring into and thinking about educational matters in order, as Henry Johnson suggests, 'to maintain

them or improve them'[4] — or, he might have added, to replace them. In a book on *Traditions*, sociologist Edward Shils, as recently as 1981, looks briefly at education as a tradition:

> Education is conservative of the past. To educate is to teach and to teach means to transmit something already possessed. To think that the education of children should be anything else at its heart is disruptive of the continuity of society and culture and hence disordering to those educated. Of course other things must be added to the tradition transmitted by education, things appropriate to the age, capacity, and vitality of the pupils... Education leaves open the possibility of modification, addition, and improvement in the works, interpretations, and achievements which make up its substance.[5]

All of the elements in this statement — 'conservative', 'transmit', 'continuity', 'modification', 'interpretation', 'achievement', are as disputed amongst historians as amongst sociologists, not simply because it is 'difficult to get the facts right', but because what historians are looking for, what they see, how they picture it, the balances and emphases they impose, are subject to the categories and the conceptual apparatus the historian chooses to employ. Historians have to construct frameworks within which to present, and if only by implication to judge, the individual and collective choices made by those who conduct the kind of processes which Shils portrays. Those choices are not clear-cut, and rarely amenable to rational decision-making on the basis of logic and evidence. Past decisions and policies may appear to have been so, and outcomes may appear to have been identical with intentions. Historians are consistently, however, uncovering the complex and elusive nature of choice and anticipated outcomes, indicating not so much the recipes that have worked as the intangible properties of the ingredients, and their possible or perhaps sometimes probable relationships to one another. In reassessing those past choices historians diminish heroes, reinstate villains, revile previous scholarship for its methodological, substantive or, therefore, theoretical inadequacy.

It is, of course, important to emphasize at the same time that historians are handling their theoretical apparatus amidst the complexities of their specifics. McPherson and Raab, in one of the most penetrating analyses of policy-making produced in the United Kingdom, are concerned both with abstract generalities and with the concrete experience of individuals.[6] Salter and Tapper, in work also of importance in the development of policy analysis in Britain, underline the importance of not allowing 'a welter of institutional analysis' to deflect attention from broader social movements; at the same time, however,

> grandiose theorizing is of little value unless its treatment of the dynamic of change allows us to understand in concrete terms what is happening around us today and what is likely to happen tomorrow.[7]

The tension between abstractions, generalities and theorizing on the one hand and concrete experience on the other hand has been central to historical debate, and is explicit in approaches as diverse as those of Marx and Butterfield. Lawrence Cremin takes issue with historians whose 'scholarly opinion' may become heavily judgmental without adequate attention to 'context, complexity, and relationship' in the analysis of education:

> As a historian, I believe it is important to make judgments, but I also believe that the judgments should be of this world and not some other.[8]

Cremin is concerned at this point in his argument with education 'past, present, and future'. Specifics, theories and judgments have future-orientations. The central point here is that while engaged in the particular processes of doing history, historians are not doing something of *service* to policy or other scholars, they *share* an orientation towards the future, a posture at the intersection of the specific and the conceptual or theoretical, a messy involvement with explaining and ordering and debating alternative realities. Distancing themselves from policy, historians misunderstand policy, but more important — they misunderstand history.

Cremin's third volume of his history of *American Education*, subtitled *The Metropolitan Experience 1876–1980*, is a valuable illustration of this argument. In this volume Cremin addresses, as in his previous work, 'the fundamental fact of complexity'.[9] He describes the trajectory he is trying to trace as one from the island communities of the nineteenth century to the 'closely integrated metropolitan communities of the twentieth', where people are defined more by race, class, ethnicity, religion and occupation than by where they live, and where government rules and policies impinge more on their lives. In this new complexity the total picture of the educative process has to be re-presented, within the overall pattern of analysis of American education Cremin has pursued since the 1960s. The book, given his search for wide 'configurations' of education experiences, is therefore as much concerned with modernism and fundamentalism in the church, or with farming, mechanization and apprenticeship, as with elementary or high schools. Within that broad coverage he seeks to present as far as possible a picture of the most important aspects of the collective, communal, educational experience of the nation. His target is the mass experience, and if that is in the church rather than the land-grant university, with a newspaper or in front of a radio or television rather than

in a junior college, then that is where the emphasis is placed. Somewhere between the grand designs of policy and day-to-day experience he is seeking an 'educational culture', its origins and transmutations and audiences. If school, in this analysis, is — together with television — only one of the 'great common educative experiences of the American people', what, ultimately, is Cremin's historical message?

More than perhaps any other historian in this field, Cremin commends a unified methodology and substance. He seems to argue that he has not only a procedure for future historians, but also a correlated view of how education should be pictured. It is by clear implication history directed towards policy. The method, the definition and the target point to an escape from education identified with the institutions of schooling. Education for Cremin equates culture, if not society itself. It would be difficult, from his starting points, to know where, if anywhere, education stops. It would also be difficult to hold on to any driving role for educational systems or institutions or ideas as they have been focussed in the past. The collapse of 'education' into the educative society is total. That, in fact, is the underlying future-orientation: society and all its institutions, not just its schools and colleges and apparatus of related policy-making and administration, must commit themselves to the educational enterprise. The book therefore not only portrays a version of the history of education as it has been, but one on the basis of which we must assume Cremin wishes it to be reformulated. The argument underscores not only how Cremin sees the future of historical scholarship, but also how he sees the future of 'education' itself. The book is, therefore, both an attempt to produce a new historical balance, and an undeclared antidote to obscurantist or dogmatic views of education and culture and the groundwork for future action to redefine and implement a more fully educative society in the circumstances of the late twentieth century — and beyond.[10]

Cremin offers an intricate but oblique example of the working of the historical consciousness in multiple time frames simultaneously. Lloyd Jorgenson's *The State and the Non-Public School 1825–1925* is another clear American example. It is over two decades since Jorgenson and David Tyack independently focussed on the roles of freemasonry and the Ku Klux Klan in Oregon in shaping a public school rhetoric with which to attack private Catholic and by implication other private education.[11] Since then there has been some historical interest in the Catholic parochial schools and other aspects of the school-religion connections, but the major focus has been elsewhere. Radical revisionist emphasis has included the previous neglect or exclusion of minorities from the mainstream of American education opportunity — blacks, ethnic minorities, women, the poor ... The position of Catholics in this revision has not been clear, and Jorgenson has here offered a sustained analysis of the processes of discri-

mination against Catholics, processes which have been largely bypassed in the historical literature of the last two decades.[12] His story is primarily one of Protestant bigotry, anti-Catholicism and mob violence, in the name of the public school, and expressed in the language of religious neutrality or secular schooling. The public school was promoted as a Protestant school by another name. He recounts the roles of Protestant clergy in the public schools, anti-Catholic textbooks, pressure groups. He portrays the ideological contexts in which Catholic communities tried to raise and educate their children from Baltimore to California, from New York to Oregon. It is an important story to have brought together in this form, and it raises clearly the profoundly complex and often disturbing issues involved in American attempts in the nineteenth century and early twentieth century to define and implement a model or models of social cohesion and educational systems. The central issues are most clearly illuminated in fact by events on the apparent periphery — the activities of Protestant clergy, the ethics of 'public' support for 'private' education (and double exploitation by taxation without participation), differences between the King James and Douay Bibles, the respective rights of parent and school as to questions of conscience... All of these, ultimately, are as central to the analysis of America's educational past as are those of race and language, gender and class, localism and federalism. They are equally central to understanding the dominant or rival interpretations of American social organization and behaviour in the present, and therefore the choices for the future. Jorgenson's 'Epilogue' raises questions about the position of non-public schools in a pluralist society, the secular nature of the public schools, the position of parents who consider religious observance an essential part of schooling, and related issues, and he ends:

> To smother discussion of these and similar questions by assertions that any departure from the status quo would be unconstitutional is to do a grave disservice to American education, both public and non-public.[13]

The questions and the exhortation are, however, unnecessary. The historical record itself disaggregates the 'status quo' into newly emphasized meanings. In opening up the past for attention, Jorgenson is addressing the future.

Much the same kind of analysis could be made of other historical literature focussing on complex understandings of American education in its social relationships — for example the literature exploring the precedence of class over social control, the interconnections of class, community, race and ethnicity, and the varieties of ways in which gender issues have impacted on all of those and others.[14] The United States may be different from other countries in this exercise only in the level of felt crisis

which generates some of this analytical attention, and in the degree of explicitness with which the disturbance is expressed. It should be remembered also — and this is particularly true of much British educational historiography — that failure to address critical issues is itself a projection into the future — an assumption that structures, processes, values, are likely to be constant. If historians of earlier generations, particularly in the United States, stand accused of serving ideologies of 'democracy' and 'progress' narrowly and exclusively interpreted, it is no less certain that — with whatever narrowness or breadth — those of the 1980s have their own overt or covert messages for policies and futures.

The historical landscape is different in British education, in part because the crises from which policy may derive have driven historians and history of education in the 1980s even more decisively from professional and academic roles than in the United States, partly because theoretical disorientation has been more complete, and partly because historical scholarship and policy and other studies have found fewer points of leverage than have their American equivalents. New and dominant Conservative interpretations of the state, public provision, forms of public and private finance and control, provoked crises of scholarly confidence and response which were relatively unfamiliar in Britain in the twentieth century, unlike in the United States where the agonies of public reappraisal (or 'crisis') have been more frequent and fundamental to the political process. For whatever reasons, British historians have very largely abandoned the field of recent educational history and policy-related or policy-implied history to 'honorary historians', whose primary focus may not be history, but for whom penetration of recent historical processes has had real priority. McPherson and Raab's understanding of the Scottish educational policy process since 1945, in *Governing Education*, is based on a sense of complex process and an appropriate methodology which, while described as a 'sociology of policy', are in fact a major contribution to the elaboration of a strategy of writing recent history. The analysis begins with a discussion of 'Policy, history and theory'. Whereas historians in such a field have tended to focus on policy-as-product, on the large political battles around particular policies, policy outcomes and the complexities of implementation, McPherson and Raab focus on the intimacies of the policy process, on the ways in which policies are generated, on the perceptions and relationships of participants, on the interrelationships of larger political and administrative pressures and the concrete experience of individuals.[15]

There are two conclusions to be drawn. First, that the history of education, whether of the kinds used here as examples, or radical, feminist, conservative or other kinds, is announcing ways of thinking about the future both of historical scholarship and of education itself. Secondly, that

historians and policy analysts — not to mention policy-makers — have a shared involvement (or a shared neglect) in locating alternative pasts and futures. Putting the two together has its pitfalls, particularly that of oversimplification. Policy is not the product of logic and rationality, the inevitable outcome of research-based, evaluation-based findings — which are themselves invariably contentious and contended. It is also the product of visible and invisible political processes, and of good and bad intentions, common and uncommon sense.[16] History, likewise, is people's versions of history — and there is no simple trajectory between some agreed past and an obvious policy for the future. If policy relates to 'crisis', there is not generally some easy consensus defining what the crisis is, whose crisis it is, where the ways out lie, and whose responsibility it is to find them and make choices. Again, American examples will serve.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 was heralded widely — even by critics, as unprecedented and 'revolutionary', as 'the most far-reaching and significant education legislation in the history of this country', as 'the greatest legislative challenge ever faced by any Congress in our Nation's history'.[17] There is, however, no easy route through its subsequent interpretation, implementation and evaluations, its amendments and transformation into the 1981 Education Consolidation and Improvement Act, and changing views about its operation, funding, necessity and effectiveness, to indicate the precise and desirable nature of policy horizons for the 1990s. Title I of the Act, the part of the Act that was seen as the most revolutionary and far-reaching, was concerned with federal support to improve the 'education of children of low-income families'.[18] Since 1965 not only have political and public priorities changed, but the implications of the very concepts of educational provision, support for low-income families, the meaning of poverty and strategies for social and economic change have also been contested from all points on the political spectrum. Assumptions about what constitutes effective public support for the education of all or particular categories of children, as well as what constitutes effective schooling, have changed in the light of research and experience. Researchers may have decided that categorical aid works or that effects of pre-school intervention of certain kinds are observable and substantial two decades later, but that offers no automatic guidance to desirable new policies to respond to continuing poverty, to the concept of disadvantage, or to the failures of children in school and of schools themselves. New policies may be informed by such evidence in changed conditions, but they are also informed by changed national and international realities, as well as by changed social tensions and pressures, changed moral and political climates.

The 1965 Act and related components of the 'War on poverty' declared by President Johnson in 1964, were a response to one complex set

of circumstances that could be termed 'crisis' — with elements that related to the 'discovery' of continuing and increasing poverty amidst affluence, the impact of the post-war baby boom on the provision and quality of schooling, racial tension and the civil rights movement, automation and unemployment. The next educational 'crisis', that of the 1980s, was different. This was not a question of using an economic expansionist moment, facing demographic growth, making liberal responses to social pressures. This was a question of declining economic competitive power and a loss of esteem for the education system. The rhetoric had moved from wider access and support for those who were failing in the system, to overall quality and the boosting of, particularly, the scientific and technological base. There are interesting parallels, which illustrate among other things how the United States faces its periodic 'crises' of this kind. The reform literature of the 1980s provoked — as in the 1960s — no widespread questioning of the reasons why the problems had taken so long to surface. The issues and the remedies were attacked with the same kind of public vigour. Programmes of action were planned, thrown together, acted upon, presented with great confidence, and promising, rapid outcomes were eagerly awaited. In both cases there was a fundamental historical silence. Secretary Bell simply announced in 1984 that 'after being eclipsed by other issues for the last twenty years, education is now at the top of our domestic agenda'.[19] At the same time Ernest Boyer, former Commissioner of Education, echoed — as did many others — the sentiment, with a slightly different time-scale for the rescue operation: '1983 was a very special year because, after more than a decade of neglect, education became a top priority again'.[20] For the *Paideia* group the nation was 'ready', and a turning point had been reached. There were some slight chinks in this analytical absolutism. One of the source materials for the National Science Board's report on *Educating Americans for the 21st Century*, published in a supplementary volume, did briefly comment on the 'partial success of the curricular developments of the late 50s, 60s and early 70s': though more was needed, much had been done.[21] Goodlad confirmed twenty-year-old judgments that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 had been 'astonishing and unprecedented'.[22] The story that then emerges out of all the reports in this reform movement is one of disillusionment, the decline in public regard for the schools. *A Nation at Risk* talked of people being 'steadfast in their belief that education is the major foundation for the future strength of this country', but having 'no patience with undemanding and superfluous high school offerings' and other features of the contemporary school. Boyer came to the conclusion that 'America believes in *education*. Increasingly, however, it has come to distrust the schools'.[23]

The difficulty, in this case, of seeing the linkages between history and

policy lies in the failure of policy-makers to even consider what it was in the recent past that they were ignoring or rejecting. The charges were simply that the wrong problems had been identified, and by some unspecified measure the schools had failed to solve the problems consigned to them by society to solve. The complexities of the past were bypassed, and the present reduced to sets of relatively simple judgments and formulae. To understand the policy operations amidst which such proclamations emerged and demands for improvement were being made, a historical perspective has to be reintroduced, especially one which considers precisely those antecedent problems and priorities which were being obsessively ignored in the creation or the magnification of the new 'crisis'. Sociologist Harry Passow put the point clearly:

> For more than two decades, urban schools in particular have been engaged in compensatory education aimed at insuring equality of educational opportunity for disadvantaged students. Though these programs have brought about a discernible improvement, if there is a real crisis in education, it is in the urban schools.[24]

The sources of such political and moral panic, the nature of policy amnesia, the realities of policy implementation and outcomes at different levels, the nature of the 'crisis' and the recurrence of 'crises' ... it is in such directions that the combined efforts of policy analysts and historians can and should lie.

This is not a case for a reductionist role for history. There is no agreed past. In looking at such recent changes in policy emphasis, if not in educational realities, a historical input needs to be aware both of the complex 'web' with which it is engaged, and the determinants of its own starting points. Historians do not have to accept the vocabulary of reform and the tenuous basis for apocalyptic policy affirmations. The historian's own originating concepts (the state, the nature of radical or conservative reform, economic decline, the purposes of schooling ...) will colour not only the judgments arrived at but the nature of the analysis in the first place. Which crisis is to be analyzed, the one tormenting national policy panels, or the one tormenting policy-makers and implementers in school districts and the schools? What historians can bring to the policy exercise is a sense of lived experience — even though historians themselves commonly ignore the portrayal and examination of that experience for other emphases.

That history is concerned with change and complexity is, of course, a truism. There is a more extended case to be made for the involvement of historians in the particular processes of the relationships between educational policy and educational change, but what is attempted here is to suggest some of the ways of beginning to approach the issues. What the

policy-makers may fail to consider amidst their political imperatives it is important for historians to confront, at the risk of reducing some of the academic distance between themselves and others in the hurly-burly of the field.

One of the features of the field that has become more prominent in recent years has been the comparative nature of much of the relevant research and debate. This has been true of policy concerns relating to work-related training at the post-secondary level, the funding of higher education, the elements of the 'effective school', research training, curriculum development, parent involvement in schools, and other aspects of educational systems and processes. One example will suffice to make the point about 'historical comparative analysis'. In an article on 'Research and policy in teachers' organizations' in 1988, Raphael Wilkins argues the case for studying the ways in which research is utilized for policy purposes by teachers' organizations in a number of countries — suggesting the National Education Association in the United States, the National Union of Teachers in the UK, the Australian Teachers' Federation and the Canadian Teachers' Federation. While recognizing the difficulties, Wilkins proposes case studies for a comparative analysis, constructing an analytical framework for establishing what organizational arrangements are in place for feeding research results into the respective unions' 'educational policy forming process' and the incidence of various categories of research utilization. Questions would need to be asked as to what 'characteristics of their national contexts ... are likely to act as significant variables' — such as government structure, national policy processes and methods of consultation and lobbying, and the relationships between the actors in the policy process[25]. This list of examples is the nearest Wilkins comes to a historical statement, and in fact there is no acknowledgment of a historical dimension to these questions. Without a historical explanation of these national differences, however, they would remain obscure. Some sense would need to be generated of the historical logics of the characteristics identified, of their cultural meanings, of their authority and effectiveness. The comparative dimension of Wilkins' proposals merely extends the argument for a historical engagement with the contemporary processes of educational change and policy. Truism or not, it is the historian's engagement with change, as well as the difficulties of representing it in policy analysis, that require the historian's presence in the contemporary educational arena, not only to trace ancestries, but also to illuminate processes.

Notes

1 Rivlin, A.M. (1987) 'Reflections on twenty years of higher education policy', *Educational Access and Achievement in America*, New York, College Entrance Examination Board, 7.

2 The American title of Aaron Wildavsky's 1979 book, published in Britain under the title *The Art and Craft of Policy Analysis*, London, Macmillan, (1980).

3 For a recent comment on this neglect see McPherson, A. and Raab, C.D. (1988) *Governing Education: A Sociology of Policy Since 1945*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, chapter 1.

4 Johnson, H.C. Jr. (1983) 'Rescuing Clio: Philosophy of history' in Best, J.H. (Ed.) *Historical Inquiry in Education: A Research Agenda*, New York, American Educational Research Association, p. 27.

5 Shils, E. (1981) *Tradition*, Chicago, IL, University of Chicago Press, p. 179.

6 McPherson, A. and Raab, C.D. (1988) *op cit.* ch. 1.

7 Salter, B. and Tapper, T. (1981) *Education, Politics and the State*, London, Grant McIntyre, p. 221.

8 Cremin, L.A. (1976) *Traditions of American Education*, New York, Basic Books, p. 127.

9 Cremin, L.A. (1988) *American Education: the metropolitan experience 1876–1980*, New York, Harper & Row, *passim*.

10 Cremin forecast the thrust of his three-volume history in *Traditions of American Education*.

11 Jorgenson, L.P. (1968) 'The Oregon school law of 1922: Passage and sequel', *Catholic Historical Review*, 54, 3; Tyack, D.B. (1968) 'The perils of pluralism: The background of the Pierce case', *American Historical Review*, 74, 1.

12 Serious attempts to treat the position of Catholic schools have in recent years included Ravitch, D. (1974) *The Great School Wars: New York City 1805–1973*, New York, Basic Books; Sanders, J.W. (1977) *The Education of an Urban Minority: Catholics in Chicago, 1833–1865*, New York, Oxford University Press; Lazerson, M. (1977) 'Understanding American Catholic educational history', *History of Education Quarterly*, 17, 3.

13 Jorgenson, L.P. (1987) *The State and the Non-Public School 1825–1925*, Columbia, MI, University of Missouri Press.

14 For example, Hogan, D.J. (1985) *Class and Reform: School and Society in Chicago, 1880–1930*, Philadelphia, PA, University of Pennsylvania Press; Katznelson, I. and Weir, M. (1985) *Schooling for All: Class, Race, and the Decline of the Democratic Ideal*, New York, Basic Books; Peterson, P.E. (1985) *The Politics of School Reform 1870–1940*, Chicago, IL, Chicago University Press; Reese, W.J. (1986) *Power and the Promise of School Reform: Grass-roots Movements During the Progressive Era*, Boston, MA, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

15 McPherson, A. and Raab, C.D. (1988) *op cit.*

16 Lindblom, C.E. and Cohen, D.K. (1979) *Usable Knowledge: Social Science and Social Problem Solving*, New Haven, CT, Yale University Press, for a discussion of how 'Professional social inquiry' is supplemented by other, including 'ordinary', knowledge (see particularly chapter 2).

17 'Revolutionary' is used too widely to cite. Washington Research Project and NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund (1967) *Title I of ESEA: Is It*

Helping Poor Children?, Washington, D.C., Washington Research Project, p. 1; the late Representative Carl Perkins in Congress, *Congressional Record*, no. 53 (House), 24 March 1965, 5559.

18 Public Law 89-10, 89th Congress, p. 1.

19 BELL, T.H. (1984) 'American education at a crossroads', *Phi Delta Kappan*, 65, 8, p. 531.

20 BOYER, E.L. (1984) 'Reflections on the great debate of '83'. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 65, 8, p. 525.

21 National Science Board Commission on Precollege Education in Mathematics, Science and Technology (1983) *Educating Americans for the 21st Century: Source Materials*, Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, p. 5.

22 GOODLAD, J.I. (1984) *A Place Called School*, New York, McGraw-Hill, p. 3.

23 BOYER, E.L. (1983) *High School*, New York, Harper & Row, pp. 281–2.

24 PASSOW, A.H. (1984) 'Tackling the reform reports of the 1980s', *Phi Delta Kappan*, 65, 10, p. 680.

25 WILKINS, R. (1988) 'Research and policy in teachers' organizations', *Journal of Education Policy*, 3, 2.

Chapter 2

Historian in a Policy Field: A British Chef in Paris?

History and policy analysis have rarely come together explicitly. Policy analysts normally disregard (or appear to disregard) history. Historians tangle with policy issues only in a limited sense, and with serious reservations. The question is — does it matter? Behind the question are considerations to do with policy analysis and research as they have developed, in particular since the 1960s and notably in the United States. The discussion also involves features of history of education and historical research, and their relationship to the social sciences and the nature of policy questions. The territories are wide, the phenomena recent, and the questions internationally sensitive because of the difficult political and economic contexts in which they have latterly emerged.

The territory is metaphorically Paris, and is in fact two territories. The first is the United States:

> ... no British social scientist who has ever visited the United States can have failed to be aware that he was in a milieu that took his calling seriously. The nearest analogy is perhaps that of an English chef visiting Paris.[1]

The second, the country of Policy Analysis, is largely coincident with the first. In the United States and some other national and international arenas, policy questions and methodologies of analysis are debated. Literatures contain 'policy' in many titles. Discussion of this second territory is inevitably often concerned with both.

'Policy analysis' is as resistant to definition as other broad and interdisciplinary fields. Wildavsky is proud to discourage students from attempting to define it.[2] It has emerged as a field and a focus — a field which, like education, is wide enough to contain diverse and conflicting approaches, but enabling those approaches to come, if not close, at least near enough to engage. The study and analysis of policy are concerned

with its formation and formulation, its contexts and constraints, its implementation and evaluation. Such studies therefore operate in a matrix, one axis of which contains the disciplinary inputs and instruments, and the other which covers the institutions, processes and levels of education susceptible to analysis. Policy analysts, while not necessarily defining the territory, often confidently indicate the disciplinary tools essential to it. For Wildavsky these include political theory, quantitative modelling, microeconomics. Many have asked how far the social sciences are the 'policy sciences'. For Kogan it is the social scientists who take apart, while the politicians and administrators reconstruct; Sharpe points to the distinguished list of American and British social scientists who have been involved as policy consultants; Ahier sees British sociology as distant from policy-making. Iannoccone and Cistone underline the parallel emergence of a politics of education and the study of policy formation in social science disciplines — and the recognition from the First World War of policy processes as a legitimate area of social science enquiry. Trow's list of contributors to the new profession of policy analyst from the early 1970s contains operational research, microeconomics, public administration, behaviourism in the social sciences, organizational theory, applied sociology and psychology, and law.[3] None of these, or other notable contributors to the literature such as Carol Weiss, include history in their lists — and the silence may be interpreted as neglect and as rejection. The historical components that can be located in some educational policy analysis is not made explicit — even, for instance, in the field of evaluation.

In the 1970s the most prominent and expanding style of policy analysis was, in fact, evaluative — the description, assessment and explanation of policy 'impact', 'effectiveness', 'outcomes'. The late 1970s and 1980s critiques, in Britain and America, of the early linear or scientistic basis of much evaluation was a recognition that evaluation was either a form of history or needed strong recent-historical reinforcement. Set in ethnographic or ethnomethodological terms, the critique was nevertheless an attempt to come to grips with complex historical processes — and in Britain evaluation specialists such as Hamilton, 'McDonald and Adelman turned to more explicitly historical explanations.[4] Neither David Kirp, in his work on British and American policies towards race, nor Maurice Kogan in his work on higher education and other educational policies, had overt intentions to write 'history', but in seeking policy explanations they had to become recent-historians, policy historians.[5] An interesting feature of the 1980s, therefore, is the emergence of education historians in Britain who have entered the field not so much — as happened in the 1960s and 1970s — from sociology or social theory, as from politics, government, evaluation, policy analysis.

The essential point is that policy analysis — like sociological, econo-

mic or any other complex analysis — pulls in at least two directions — towards theoretical explanations or models, and towards description and attempts at causal or developmental explanation. The problem is one that is familiar in other fields also — that of allocating priority to the one over the other while attempting to reconcile the two. The history-policy relationship does not escape the American debates of the 1960s around revisionist concern with explicitly theory-based interpretations, or the European debates around history and theory. It transfers them to new ground.

What it also does is thrust the discussion into a more detailed confrontation with 'presentism' than was provoked by Bailyn's arguments of 1960.[6] American second-wave, more radical or neo-Marxist revisionism suggested that what presentism did to scholars was imprison them in problems as defined by contemporary capitalism, prevent them from looking historically at alternative social strategies or processes that were available or overruled in the past. The result was a new look at the past and a search for new definitions of the problems of the present — a history-from-first-base, overturning assumptions about and approaches to all aspects of educational 'reform'. The quality of much of the work produced on the corporate state or bureaucracy, 'progressive' reformers, the educational politics of parties and governments, announced the difficulty of reaching second base or beyond. Historical attempts to approach disturbing or controversial contemporary issues have been slim or tenuous. American historians of education have, indeed, tangled with urban education or accountability or the education of black Americans or aspects of federalism. Internationally, however, historians of education have tended to distance themselves from the issues surfacing in their local or wider policy-forming processes.

The aim here therefore is to broach two aspects of the problem of this set of relationships. The first is to set out some aspects of the nature of policy analysis, on the dual assumption that it involves — as James Q. Wilson put it — 'statements about what has happened in the past, not speculations about what may happen in the future',[7] but that policy analysts do not generally make the historical dimension explicit. The second is to consider why historians, who constantly encounter policy considerations in one way or another, have not wished to be seen entering the policy arena. In both cases the specific target is education — its policy processes and history.

Issues which preoccupy policy analysts include, first, the relationship between policy-related research and sponsoring bodies, and secondly the ways in which the outcomes of policy research and analysis reach, or fail to reach, have impact or no impact, on the policy- and decision-making processes themselves. The question of relationship raises unease about the

independence of the researcher in policy-related work and about the expectations of politicians and administrators of the research they sponsor. The immediate problem of policy-related research is the urgency, the solution-orientation of the issue, its current emphasis and definition. Research and analysis intended to feed into current preoccupations inevitably arouse anxieties about the purpose of the research, the use to which it is to be put, the possibility of its becoming part of the process of legitimating policy and power.[8] However much social scientists and others engaged in the exercise may argue that it is a waste of time expecting policy analysis to produce 'solutions', to answer the questions of the day as they are perceived in the present,[9] the expectations of sponsors include the hope or the intention that processes will be influenced, advice tendered, results obtained. Coleman argues, with some justification, that the outcomes of research produced in conflict situations may be used, in fact, more by those challenging authority than by authority itself.[10] Policy analysts and evaluators have considerable interest in the processes by which their results are disseminated and in the uses likely to be made of them. Scholars in the policy field are aware of, and debate, these issues, and the variety and instability of their relationships and roles. Wilson indicates, for example, the changed position of 'policy intellectuals' from priests of the established order in the 1960s, to that of missionaries in hostile country in the 1980s.[11] The way scholars on the frontiers of the field perceive the activity inside it is profoundly influenced by perceptions of the relationships which govern the activity itself. As an emergent field of study, policy analysis also has to face suspicion from, for example, some forms of radical theory — concerned at what may appear to be its inevitable empiricism or its diversion of attention from critical theory and concern with structure. Whereas within established academic disciplines radical theory is able to maintain a serious presence, it considers the policy field not so much one in which to operate as one whose validity it may need to deny. The issues of concern within the field, therefore, may themselves be subject to theoretical dismissal from outside.

Within the field questions of the relationships of social constituencies, methodologies of analysis, knowledge-policy and policy-implementation relationships, and the purposes, uses and boundaries of research, are among those most debated. Concern with the impact of research on policy is an example of the diverse directions of interest and debate. Are the value systems of researchers and policy makers, Husen asks, too different to permit research in the policy area to be adequately used? Does research in the policy area produce knowledge, data and information which are directly useful to policy makers — and does an assumption about inadequate knowledge utilization suggest simplistic and erroneous notions of how knowledge can be utilized?[12] Caplan points out that US govern-

ment sponsorship of research has increasingly required dissemination and utilization plans to be built in to grant proposals.[13] Bardach suggests that research does reach policy makers where the value of effort to absorb and use findings outweighs the cost of not doing so.[14] The research-policy 'gap', in other words, which was of forefront interest to policy scholars in the 1960s and 1970s has begun to disappear as the simple diagrams of policy impact, as it is and might be, have given way to more complex models of knowledge production and dissemination, and of the policy-making process itself.[15]

What then, are policy analysts doing? They are, according to Wildavsky, attempting to speak truth to power.[16] They are attempting to reveal how decisions are made, and by implication or explicitly suggest how they may more rationally be made. They are attempting to see how minuscule or major, sporadic or consistent, decisions may, in Weiss's phraseology, 'accrete' and form the larger entity called policy.[17] The process is one of sustained efforts at rationality, in the analysis and in the effort to influence. The growth of US federal involvement in education in the 1960s and 1970s provides an excellent example, one which large numbers of scholars have addressed from many different directions.[18] Their analyses encompass different levels of research use or presentation, and all are aimed at exposing essential elements in structures and processes, power relations and decision-making opportunities, focussing on changing patterns and perceptions of federal activity in education. They are efforts at rational analysis, but they touch upon contentious issues and feed into major political sensitivities. Kogan's work on British policy processes constantly underlines the complex interplay of the roles of the participants: he describes the system as a whole as being 'pluralistic, incremental, unsystematic, reactive — how untidy the total system is. Yet those possessing authority are decisive'.[19] The effort at rationality is both difficult, and, in the face of interlocking versions of power or 'authority', always sensitive.

There are, in addition to these problems, rival versions of how policy intellectuals and their findings can relate to the policy-producing exercise. The processes and relationships are defined dichotomously: as enlightenment versus engineering, as enlightenment and engineering versus political, as cybernetic versus pluralistic.[20] What is at stake in such discussion is the degree to which policy-related research and analysis face the policy process directly, in some sort of 'closed' system. These are questions both of how research and knowledge relate to policy-making, and also of the position of the analyst. Policy analysis, Trow emphasizes, is broader than policy research, and the policy analyst has emerged in a territory between that of the researcher and the decision-maker.[21] The role contains diverse elements of message-interpreting and message-conveying, but also the

difficulties of operating in the space where Husen's two value systems meet. The literature generally seeks to illuminate how the diffusion of knowledge affects both decisions and policy, or alternatively how it percolates into the system or the political environment. Cohen and Garet discuss policy in terms of a 'grand story', a constellation of assumptions, a diffuse process in which evidence (rather than data) is held together by larger ideas and assumptions. It is into these larger frameworks that they see research and analysis penetrating, with outcomes different from those postulated by simpler models of the effects of research on planning.[22]

These features of policy analysis are not a portrait. They suggest some elements of the activity as perceived inside the frontier, and by uncertain spectators outside it.

The hesitations of the historian have basically to do with the possibilities of contamination, as in their extensive past dialogues with social scientists. The concerns of historians about too close an involvement with policy issues or other interdisciplinary fields include the nature of social science models, levels of generalization, and the claims and status of social science knowledge. The accumulation of evanescent data, the pursuit of rival methodologies or unceasingly controversial grand social theory, often give historians — even amidst their parallel battles — reason to pause. They hear echoes of doubts about the applicability of social science knowledge (Moynihan being only amongst the more explicit doubters, with his public recantation: 'I have been guilty of optimism about the use of social-science knowledge in the management of public affairs'[23]). The policy field therefore appears doubly worrying.

Historians also hesitate about fields closely related to ideological positions and contemporary political judgment. Legislation, actual or proposed, in fields such as child welfare, early childhood education, and family support schemes of one kind or another, involve assumptions about childhood and family, the proper role of public agencies in 'rescuing' or protecting children, in directing or influencing parental roles, in strengthening existing institutions or establishing or encouraging alternatives. Hence the problems faced and strategies of analysis having to be developed by American historians such as Barbara Finkelstein, and Grubb and Lazerson, in entering such fields where they are aware of the policy ambiguities which reign.[24]

If such reservations about the judgmental nature of the policy field are held implicitly to be important by some outsiders, another set of reservations emerges — the probability that policy analysis is superficial, wrongly targeted at low-order processes, and inevitably conservative in direction and effect. History and policy, from this point of view, would be a conservative alliance. This argument might be conducted roughly along

the following lines, starting with the appearance, in the 1970s and early 1980s, of a sustained interest in educational policy *studies* in a substantial number of institutions. This academic development in the US has involved two handicaps, neither of which has been overcome. The first has been the institutional development of educational policy studies, enshrined in divisions, units, institutes and departments. This has aroused some scepticism, given their origin — an attempt in many cases to compensate for the dwindling support for 'educational foundations' including the history, philosophy and sociology of education, comparative education and educational administration. Yoking some or all of these together to form new, hopefully prestigious and well populated departments of policy studies, has been neither easy nor successful in producing any obvious new coherence. It has not stemmed the drift towards more marketable areas of educational qualification, or towards policy departments or schools — especially graduate ones — based on the social or political sciences.

The second handicap has been suspicion about the identification of an interest in policy studies with shifts in public policy itself — outstandingly in education — towards more conservative positions. As, in many countries, government policies moved away from the expansive, egalitarian, meritocratic, even radical, bases of the decade from the mid-1960s, and as government support for social-scientific and educational research diminished, so did policy-related studies and research have to relocate themselves in an unfamiliar and unfriendly context. A flurry of interest amongst some US historians in policy studies did not, in these conditions, make easy academic headway.

If policy research and analysis are intended to be influential or useful in any way whatever, historians and others may therefore see them as being potentially influential or useful in the wrong directions. Many historians would also view policy research as necessarily pointing towards conclusions and recommendations, and they would not see their own interests and scholarship as pointing that way. They might consider such activity as falsely seeking 'scientific' legitimacy and authority, or raising false expectations of utility. They would hear hints of long abandoned attempts to read the 'lessons of history'. At no time would such fears be more pronounced than in an age of economic constraint and political conservatism. Policy research becomes, in such an interpretation, misguided research serving essentially bureaucratic or conservative purposes, since economic and political conservatism will use what serves it and reject pointers in directions other than its preconceived ones. Kogan and Atkin, using the British examples of the Robbins Committee on higher education and the Plowden Committee on primary education, and the

American example of the Johnson task forces, suggest in any case that governments appoint committees and commission research when they already have a target and wish to legitimate their existing opinions.[25]

A more radical version of such hesitations about involvement in policy analysis would suggest that policy issues can only be understood by attention to underlying political and economic realities, not to the surface play of policy interests. Michael Katz, for instance (drawing on arguments from Henry Levin and others), reflecting on the history of educational reform, makes the firmest possible statement:

> . . . the forces most powerfully affecting schools do not flow from educational planning or policy. Nor have they ever. That, certainly, is one message of educational history.[26]

The logic of this would appear to be that historians engaging in the analysis of educational policy would be simply illustrating its weakness and futility. The truth in the logic is that the study of educational policy will, of course, be superficial if it remains encapsulated within the terms of reference dictated by policy-makers: there has to be a context of reference outside the stated policy purposes and the description of their operation. So much hardly seems necessary to argue after the debates in and outside educational history over the past quarter of a century. The argument still to be pursued, however, is the nature of the forces which do most powerfully affect schools, and — in the present discussion specifically — how these differ from or relate to educational planning and policy. The longer perspective and the larger forces need to enter constantly into dialogue with the world as we experience and attempt to cope with and reconstruct it.

There are other hesitations. There is, for example, the tyranny of concepts in the analysis of policy. Kirp suggests, for instance, how the confrontation of racial issues in Britain was prevented at least in part in the 1960s and 1970s by the existing dominant discourse of social class into which questions of race were absorbed.[27] There is the policy controversy, mess, uncertainty, confusion. Conant published his *Shaping Educational Policy* in 1964 precisely in order to draw attention to policy confusion (for example, over the education of gifted children), and the inappropriateness of haphazard policy-making for the 1960s.[28] Aaron's considered reflections, at the end of the 1970s, on social science research and its use in the period of the 1960s Great Society policies, point to unabated theory rivalry, and social science following in the wake of policy rather than influencing it.[29] How much more rationality and how much less policy confusion Conant would have found ten or twenty years later is difficult to imagine.

The question whether policy processes are proper areas of historical enquiry therefore resolves itself into a variety of sub-considerations to do,

for example, with levels of analysis and conceptual alternatives, the roles of scholars, the relationship of historical scholarship to activities whose historical, contemporary and predictive components are so unclear. The overarching question becomes Wildavsky's — are policy analysts 'hired guns'?[30] The context and the purpose become all important. Vickers uncovers the complexities of the relationships between policy and values; Kogan and colleagues follow through the impact and implications of the Rothschild report on the contractual principle between government departments and researchers — as manifested in the health service, but with messages for other public services.[31] To the historian, whatever the answer to Wildavsky's question, the question is damaging enough. Policy analysis, for all its apparent rationality, ends in attitudes and controversy. And in any case, historians are not overly concerned about rationality. Historians looking at contemporary policy issues in education might share 'humanistic doubts' about rationality as a basis for choice.[32] They might reject a policy interest as being unscholarly or instrumental or both.

Two separate strands now need to be underlined. First, policy analysts write history. Secondly, historians have responsibilities, and enter a policy arena with the same confusions and impurities as anyone else.

The first proposition hardly needs emphasizing. If, in the United States, Sarason and Doris ask why policy towards the handicapped changed in 1975, the recent-historical component of policy analysis becomes explicit. If Kirp explores the relationship between centralization, regulation and control, he is suggesting a sequence and implying, if not stating, historical explanations. If, in Britain, Fenwick and McBride ask how, in the government of education, thought and ideology turn into policy and commitment and action, they are raising directly historical questions.[33] What many social scientists and policy analysts have no doubt reacted against is, first, a particular tradition of historiography which, with its descriptive and narrative style and narrow interpretation of what constitutes historical explanation, has not seemed to fit the search for complex interdisciplinary understandings in the policy arena. Secondly, they have seen in the past two decades, specifically in the United States, the commitment of some historians and social and political scientists writing educational history, to total historical schemata, in which specific policy considerations play, and could play, little or no part. It may not be surprising that, as we suggested at the outset, policy analysts have not given history a place in their lists of contributory disciplines.

How historians see their roles and responsibilities in relation to such activities is even more conjectural, given their distance from the exercise. There has, of course, been in all countries a long tradition of the writing of certain kinds of educational policy history as a by-product of the history of the nation, the state and its political structures. In its earliest guises in

Britain this was the preoccupation of a Craik or a Balfour with Parliament, legislation, finance, emergent structures.[34] It was the record of the sequence of some national logic. The policy history which followed was that of legislative decision-making and its implementation. The history of educational policy in that sense, therefore, became the history of institutional politics and administration. In later decades, and recently , the history of policy concerns has been represented by such works as Graves's account of *Policy and Progress in Secondary Education*, from 1902 to the Second World War (and then by the large number of studies of comprehensive reorganization); Sutherland's *Policy-Making in Elementary Education 1870–1895*, which looks at the complex interactions involved in disentangling policy-makers and policy-making in that period; and the third volume of Simon's *Studies in the History of Education*, covering the period 1920–1940, in which he pursues various levels of political interaction relating to crucial educational decisions.[35] This tradition of policy description and explanation is different from policy analysts' concerns in that the overriding concerns are distant rather than close (the comprehensive school issue is the outstanding exception), and concerned more to trace a thread or a tangle of threads than specifically to address a contemporary theme. Nor is this work as concerned as is that of policy analysts with its own methodology, with theorizing about the issues and their context — and the analysis itself. This is not to belittle this historical tradition — it is to differentiate it from the concerns we have discussed.

A second aspect of historical concern, again focussing on Britain, has to do with the ease with which historians, when they do approach contemporary issues in education, become captured by overwhelming ones. Again, this is particularly true of the political histories of comprehensive reorganization in the 1950s–1970s, not simply because the comprehensive school was a policy issue, but because it was one which more than any other in education enabled the explanations to be organized in terms of social class. British historians in this period, tracing the history of secondary education in particular and education in general, had no difficulty in using the language and instruments of class analysis — however different an emphasis different historians might place. British history of education was in this respect built on Disraelian two-nation analysis, and especially on Fabian analysis of the two educational systems of the nineteenth century. The comprehensive school was both an immediate policy issue and a distant one — in that it was the area of education where the nineteenth century could most easily be seen still to exist. Historians found it more difficult to carry this kind of policy history into other areas of recent or current interest — with a paucity of work by historians on early childhood education, further education, higher education, special education and the curricular and other processes of schooling. The gap was filled by non-historians entering the field — Tessa Blackstone's work

on the history of nursery education being one example.[36] The historian of education tended to remain, like the sociologists who set the pace for educational research and analysis, involved with processes *obviously* illustrative of social class, or to focus on the history of structures and institutions rather than policy processes.

It is in the United States that historians have in recent decades begun to assume somewhat different roles. In the wake of the revisionist debates many historians have had to assess their own position in relation to ideological and theoretical starting points in the analysis of contemporary America and its institutions. Some historians — Tyack and various colleagues would be the best example — have set out to explore history not, Hansot and Tyack suggest, as a prescription but as an advantage for policy makers.[37] Social scientists began to summon history to help with the difficult theoretical and analytical tangles into which specific policy areas had degenerated. Historians, including historians of education, were being involved as consultants and participants in policy-making processes, as public affairs analysts, in public and government agencies of various kinds, and 'public history' became a new phenomenon.[38] Historians were offering perspective, acting as editors and appearing in the inner circles of policy concerns — not in droves, but sufficiently to indicate points of departure, and directions.[39]

The relationship between history and policy analysts and historians is not finally solved by the interventions of policy analysts like Kogan into the historical field, or of historians like Tyack in the reverse direction. There are questions to be resolved, and the range of hesitations we have signalled need to be overcome, through longer participation and collaboration by historians in fields of contemporary policy enquiry. The essential question for historians of education may be whether they can afford to leave the inevitable historical component of policy analysis to the honorary historian. Or perhaps more accurately, can historians fail to provide the policy enterprise with the perspectives, the attempted clarifications over appropriate timescales, which policy analysis requires? The starting point for them has to be what sociologist Grace calls the 'heuristic power of historical enquiry'.[40] It is difficult to conclude from the above outline of some key policy concerns and difficulties that historians' purity requires them to abstain. It is difficult to deduce from a summary of historians' hesitations about a sensitive field that they have no contribution to make to more successful interpretations of the social and political processes of however unfriendly an age. It is difficult to sustain a historical posture that is allegedly distant from the judgmental and other features of policy analysis.

If there is in the policy arena limited, unproblematic or inappropriate history, it becomes necessary to undermine or displace it. If the models in use are rooted in a theory too abstracted from experience and historical

questioning, the questions need to be asked sharply. If the interdisciplinary 'team' of policy contributors has omitted the historian, the claims of historical enquiry need to be established. Insights into the tyranny of assumptions about, or oversimplified versions of, the past need to be contributed to the policy enterprise. The ritualistic, introductory historical paragraph to a paper, or chapter to a dissertation or a book, needs to be questioned, and historical commitment established as a form, not of context, but of critical analysis. Graham, Tyack and Wilson have in various ways drawn attention to the role of history not as 'lessons' from the past which might indicate what policy should rightly do, but as prevention, as warnings against what did not work, what it might be preferable to avoid.[41] What the historian can best and most frequently do for policy analysis is to introduce what Hansot and Tyack discuss in terms of rendering problematic and introducing psychological distance. The former is no monopoly of the historian, but where history is dubious or absent, it would be possible for it to become an important lever of analysis. The latter is a frame of mind to which theorists of policy analysis occasionally turn — again often avoiding attributing the quality to the historian. Wildavsky commits himself to the importance of the 'retrospective', to establishing a view of the past as justifying a desired future,[42] but the argument does not embrace the role of the historian or the procedures of historical analysis.

In determining a proper role for themselves historians will be inevitably and usefully compelled to review their own organizing concepts and assumptions, to learn from evaluators, ethnographers and others grappling from different directions with the same complex sequences and processes. Policy analysis, as a direction of inter- or multidisciplinary enquiry, is in need of serious historical inputs and requires of historians of education that they should more clearly understand and engage with the issues. A small number of American historians have pointed to different paths along which other chefs can enter the territory.

Notes

1 SHARPE, L.J. (1978) 'The social scientist and policy-making in Britain and America: A comparison' in BULMER, M. (Ed.), *Social Policy Research*, London, Macmillan, p. 303.

2 WILDAVSKY, A. (1980) *The Art and Craft of Policy Analysis*, London, Macmillan, London (first published 1979), p. 2.

3 *ibid.*, p. 3; KOGAN, M. (1979) 'Different frameworks for educational policy making and analysis', *Educational Analysis*, 1, 2, p. 8; SHARPE, L.J. (1975) *op cit*, p. 306; AHIER, J. (1983) 'History and sociology of educational policy' in AHIER, J. and FLUDE, M. (Eds) *Contemporary Education Policy*, London,

Croom Helm, p. 3; IANNACCONE, L. and CISTONE , P.J. (1974) *The Politics of Education*, Eugene, OR. ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, p. 7; TROW, M. (1984) 'Researchers, policy analysts and policy intellectuals' in HUSEN, T. and KOGAN, M. (Eds) *Educational Research and Policy*, Oxford, Pergamon, p. 264.

4 HAMILTON, D. (1980) 'Adam Smith and the moral economy of the classroom', *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 12, 4; HAMILTON, D. (1977) *In Search of Structure*, London, Hodder & Stoughton; MACDONALD, B. (1982) 'Curriculum in prospect' in MACDONALD, B. *et al.* (Eds) *Bread and Dreams: A Case Study of Bilingual Schooling in the U.S.A.*, Norwich, CARE, University of East Anglia; ADELMAN, C. (Ed.) (1984) *The Politics and Ethics of Evaluation*, London, Croom Helm; ADELMAN, C. (1984) 'The playhouse and the sandtray' in GOODSON, I.F. and BALL, S.J. (Eds) *Defining the Curriculum: Histories and Ethnographies*, Lewes, Falmer Press.

5 KOGAN, M. (1971) *The Politics of Education*, Harmondsworth, Penguin; KOGAN, M. (1978) *The Politics of Educational Change*, London, Fontana; KIRP, D.L. (1979) *Doing Good by Doing Little: Race and Schooling in Britain*, Berkeley, CA. University of California Press; KIRP, D.L. (1982) *Just Schools: The Idea of Racial Equality in American Education*, Berkeley, CA, University of California Press.

6 BAILYN, B. (1960) *Education in the Forming of American Society*, Chapel Hill, NC, University of North Carolina Press.

7 WILSON, J.Q. (1981) '"Policy intellectuals" and public policy', *The Public Interest*, 64, p. 41.

8 KOGAN, M. and ATKIN, J.M. (1982) *Legitimating Education Policy: The Use of Special Committees in Formulating Policies in the USA and the UK*, Palo Alto, CA, Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance, Stanford University, particularly pp. 60–1 and 76–81.

9 THOMAS, P. (1982) 'Social research and government policy: Heyworth, Rothschild and after', *Futures*, February, p. 2.

10 COLEMAN, J.S. (1984) 'Issues in the institutionalisation of social policy', in HUSEN, T. and KOGAN, M. (Eds) *op cit*, p. 131.

11 WILSON, J.Q. (1981) *op cit*, p. 31.

12 HUSEN, T. (1984) 'Issues and their background' in HUSEN, T. and KOGAN, M. (Eds) *op cit*, pp. 20–1; WEISS, C.H. (1980) 'Knowledge creep and decision accretion', *Knowledge*, 1, 3, particularly pp. 381 and 396–8; COHEN, D.K. and GARET, M.S. (1975) 'Reforming educational policy with applied social research', *Harvard Educational Review*, 45, 1.

13 CAPLAN, N. (1982) 'Social research and public policy at the national level' in KALLEN, D.B.P. *et al.* (Eds) *Social Science Research and Public Policy-Making: a reappraisal*. Windsor, NFER-Nelson, p. 32.

14 BARDACH, E. (1983) 'The dissemination of policy research to policy-makers', Berkeley, CA, mimeo, p. 1.

15 LINDBLOM, C.E. and COHEN, D.K. (1979) *Usable Knowledge: social science and social problem solving*, New Haven, CT, Yale University Press; WEISS, C.H. (1979) 'The many meanings of research utilization', *Public administration Review*, September/October; WEISS, C.H. (1982) 'Policy research in the context of diffuse decision-making' in KALLEN, D.B.P. *et al.* (Eds) *op cit*.

16 WILDAVSKY, A. (1980) *op cit*, p. 12.

17 WEISS, C. (1980) *op cit*.

18 See, for example, ELMORE, R.F. and MCLAUGHLIN, M.W. (1982) 'Federal

education policy, compliance and assistance' in LIEBERMAN, A. and MCLAUGHLIN, M.W. (Eds) *Policy Making in Education*, Chicago, IL, NSSE; MOSHER, E.K. (1977) 'Education and American federalism: intergovernmental and national policy influences' in SCRIBNER, J.D. (Ed.), *The Politics of Education*, Chicago, IL, NSSE; SCHUSTER, J.H. (1982) 'Out of the frying pan: The politics of education in a new era', *Phi Delta Kappan*, 63, 9.

19 KOGAN, M. (1975) *Educational Policy-Making: A Study of Interest Groups and Parliament*, London, Allen & Unwin, p. 238.

20 Weiss discusses the processes of 'enlightenment' and 'percolation' in all the works cited above. Trow discusses the 'political' model in 'Researchers, policy analysts and policy intellectuals'. Martin Bulmer discusses the 'engineering' and 'enlightenment' models in (1982) *The Uses of Social Research: Social Investigation in Public Policy-making*, London, Allen & Unwin, pp. 42–6. Coleman pursues the cybernetic/pluralistic distinction in 'Issues in the institutionalization of social policy'.

21 TROW, M. (1984) *op cit*, pp. 262–3.

22 COHEN, D.K. and GARET, M.S. (1975) *op cit*, p. 21.

23 MOYNIHAN, D.P. (1970) 'Liberalism and knowledge', in *Coping: On the Practice of Government*, Random House, New York (1975 edn), p. 260.

24 FINKELSTEIN, B. (1984) 'Uncle Sam and the children: History of government involvement in child rearing' in HINER, N.R. and HAWES, J. (Eds) *Growing Up in America: Children in Historical Perspective*, Champaign-Urbana, IL, University of Illinois Press; FINKELSTEIN, B. (1984) 'Incorporating children into the history of education', *JET: the Journal of Educational Thought*, 1, p. 18; GRUBB, W.N. and LAZERSON, M. (1982) *Broken Promises: How Americans Fail Their Children*, New York, Basic Books.

25 KOGAN, M. and ATKIN, J.M. (1982) *op cit*, pp. 60–1 and 78–81.

26 KATZ, M.B. (1980) 'Reflections on the purpose of educational reform', *Educational Theory*, 30, 2, p. 85.

27 KIRP, D.L. (1979) *op cit*, particularly chapter 2.

28 CONANT, J.B. (1964) *Shaping Educational Policy*, New York, McGraw-Hill.

29 AARON, H.J. (1978) *Politics and the Professors: The Great Society in Perspective*, Washington, D.C., Brookings Institution, particularly pp. 164–9.

30 WILDAVSKY, A. (1980) *op cit*, p. 13.

31 VICKERS, G. (1970) *Value Systems and the Social Process*, Harmondsworth, Penguin; KOGAN, M., KORMAN, N. and HENKEL, M. (1980) *Government's Commissioning of Research: A Case Study*, Uxbridge, Brunel University; KOGAN, M. and HENKEL, M. (1983) *Government and Research: The Rothschild Experiment in a Government Department*, London, Heinemann.

32 BLACK, M. (Ed.) (1975) *Problems of Choice and Decision: Proceedings of a Colloquium held in Aspen, Colorado ... 1974*, Ithaca and Aspen, Cornell University and Aspen Institute.

33 SARASON, S.B. and DORIS, J. (1982) 'Public policy and the handicapped: The case of mainstreaming', in LIEBERMAN, A. and MCLAUGHLIN, M.W. (Eds) *op cit*; KIRP, D.L. (1983) *The Fourth R: Reading, Writing, 'Rithmetic — and Rules*, Stanford, CA, Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance, Stanford, University; FENWICK, K. and MCBRIDE, P. (1981) *The Government of Education in Britain*, Oxford, Martin Robertson.

34 CRAIK, H. (1884) *The State in its Relation to Education*, London, Macmillan; BALFOUR, G. (1898) *The Educational Systems of Great Britain and Ireland*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.

35 GRAVES, J. (1943) *Policy and Progress in Secondary Education 1902–1942*, London, Nelson; SUTHERLAND, G. (1973) *Policy-Making in Elementary Education 1870–1895*, London, Oxford University Press; SIMON, B. (1974) *The Politics of Educational Reform 1920–1940*, London, Lawrence & Wishart.

36 BLACKSTONE, T. (1971) *A Fair Start: The Provision of Pre-School Education*, London, Allen Lane.

37 HANSOT, E. and TYACK, D. (1982) 'A usable past' in LIEBERMAN, A. and MCLAUGHLIN, M.W. (Eds) *op cit*, p. 16.

38 For discussions of this historical trend see BECK, P.J. (1983) 'History goes public', *Times Higher Education Supplement*, 21 January, p. 13; FLOYD, C. (1984) 'The historian in the gray flannel suit', *History News*, 39, 5.

39 GRAHAM, P.A. (1980) 'Historians as policy makers', *Educational Researcher*, December.

40 GRACE, G. (1984) *Judging Teachers: The Social and Political Contexts of Teacher Evaluation*, Cambridge, University of Cambridge Department of Education, mimeo.

41 GRAHAM, P.A. (1980) *op cit*, p. 22; TYACK, D.B. (n.d.) 'History and policy-making in public education: A reappraisal' in WALBERG, H.J. (Ed.) *American Education: Diversity and Research*, Voice of America, Forum Series, p. 31; WILSON, J.Q. (1981) *op cit*, p. 43.

42 WILDAVSKY, A. (1980) *op cit*, p. 14; WILSON, J.Q. (1981) *op cit*, p. 44.

Chapter 3

The Escaping Answer

> The question of what precisely quality is, and how it should be assessed (let alone measured) has . . . persistently escaped answer; and this is possibly inevitable. (National Advisory Body for Public Sector Higher Education, 1984).

Accounts of policy making for and in British higher education have to contend with difficulties inherent in portraying the transition from a group of disparate institutions held together by a tradition and a culture, to a twentieth-century 'system' in which its 'sectors' face collective issues of funding and direction. As Banting underlines, however, 'the making of policy is both an intellectual activity and an institutional process'. The decisions that change laws are the products both of individual minds and of limits set by the structure of institutions and their relations with the wider society. Banting took as the focus of his study of British 'poverty, politics and policy' in the 1960s the two processes, intellectual and institutional, and the tension between them.[1] The history of higher education policy illustrates how the balance of such a tension changes, not only as the personnel of government and influential public debate change, but also as the nature of the institutions engaged in the debate and the activity change. Policy changes in higher education have stemmed from perceptions of religious and secular responsibilities, openness and exclusiveness, allegiance to tradition and roles in innovation. They have also stemmed from the processes of church and government, university and labour market as themselves 'institutional processes'. The tension between the two has produced both policy and failure to make policy.

A rounded picture of policy-making relating to higher education in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, for example, would therefore be a history of the role of the state and the church, industrialism and 'modernism', the professions and other key employments, the protagonists of one or another version of a liberal education, and of one or another version of

curricular change. It would also be a history of how the institutions concerned have ordered their affairs, have intended to preserve or to modify their operations, with what purposes and under what changing conditions. How British higher education has developed its images and practices regarding the establishment and maintenance of the quality of its operations offers one focus, therefore, on the policy horizons of higher education institutions themselves. It is that focus, particularly in the second half of the twentieth century, that is our immediate concern in this chapter.

During the First World War the University College of Southampton attempted to define what it meant by the standard of a university degree. It was

> a guarantee that the holder has attained to a standard of education which justifies his employment in any one of many professions or occupations. It is at the same time evidence of diligence in study, power of concentrating attention, and intelligence in interpreting the bearings of facts.[2]

These benchmarks, with the possible exception of 'interpreting', would have been unthinkable in the commentaries of the main nineteenth-century spokesmen for university education. During the Second World War Southampton's Principal reflected on the College's history and future. Progress was difficult, 'in view of the pressure of public opinion with regard to "results" on the one side, and on the other the fact that the College has to deal with an external examination' that of the University of London. It was essential to avoid becoming 'a factory for procuring degrees for those who may or may not deserve them'. The pressures and aims were different from those of a quarter of a century earlier. The concern now was for 'educated men and women who can think and reason with pliable and lively minds . . . who can become leaders in the generation that is to follow'. They needed, of course, 'knowledge, accuracy, and understanding', but 'above all capacity for handling problems and gathering round them willing cooperators in the work of developing a new society'.[3] The grounds for judging achievement shift as the world changes; the heights to be scaled do not remain the same.

The transitions of the 1862 Hartley Institution through the Hartley University College to the University College of Southampton and, in 1952, to the University of Southampton, and from London external degrees to autonomy, from the intimacies of a small institution to the modern scale, from standards as internally debated and negotiated with the University Grants Committee (UGC) to the external scrutinies of the late twentieth century — these would be one detailed case study through which to approach the elusive concern — or lack of concern — with

44

standards and quality. Any other university institution would serve the same purpose. The emergence in the twentieth century of a public sector of 'higher education', the changing vocabularies of 'sponsorship', 'advisory committee', 'validation' and 'accreditation', are all entry points to considerations of standards. So are nineteenth- and twentieth-century comparisons with other debates about standards in higher education — and comparison with the accreditation and other procedures in American higher education would also be revealing. Some of these threads in the history of the pursuit of standards are our concern here.

The main nineteenth-century debates concerning higher — that is, university — education were about provision and curriculum — about a liberal education, about the social-class and religious exclusiveness of Oxford and Cambridge, about the range of studies in new and aspiring institutions. The creation of London University and later the provincial colleges raised explicit questions about their purposes rather than about standards — though there were concerns that the new metropolitan university, for instance, might result in an 'indiscriminate and unlimited issue of degrees'.[4] The notion of standards was more implicit in the discussion of institutional hierarchies, the association of different institutions with different social and occupational clienteles, and the acquisition of access by religious and social groups previously debarred in England and dependent on Scotland and Europe for post-school opportunities.

Within the ancient universities the slow processes of reform related not only to the modernization of curricula and wider access, but also to the control and encouragement of student learning and attainment. At the end of the eighteenth century Cambridge introduced not only its mathematics tripos but also, in 1792, a system of 'marks' for mathematics papers, beginning a process of proxy representation of attainment which spread during the nineteenth century, replacing oral methods of examining — 'the major single step towards a mathematized model of reality'.[5]

Other examination structures were set in place. The tripos was extended to classics in 1824 and offered a model that was to be irresistible in nineteenth-century conditions. It

> stressed method — technique, precision, logic and rigour — and method was transferable... The tripos was held to be scientific in ideals, content, and in its method of determining ability. Unlike Oxford, Cambridge ranked its honours men on a strict order of merit... This intensified the competition for honours and made many believe that the tripos system of marking was a scrupulously objective method of selection.[6]

In this and other ways university and school education for the privileged and for widening circles of children of the middle and professional classes

was being subjected to scrutiny. The new institutions needed to present their staff, students, courses and graduates as of a suitable standard to meet the expectations of those under whose gaze they were created and sustained. Their qualifying examinations put pressure on the schools to raise the standard of entrants. After its foundation, Owens College, Manchester, found that 'the school education of Manchester was so bad ... that the students were insufficiently prepared to receive the benefits of true collegiate training'. The College, struggling to adhere to high standards, 'literally pulled up the schools to a much more thorough training both as to discipline and teaching'.[7] As professional studies penetrated the universities and colleges later in the century, the institutions were affected by the competition and by the expectations of the growingly status-conscious professions concerned. Ben-David describes this process as one of improvement in the quality of education based not 'on a general conception but on ad hoc judgments' (by which requirements of, for example, the Society of Apothecaries were compared with those of the Royal College of Physicians, or the teaching of a subject at University College, London, with that at Oxford). There were no basic criteria of professional or academic quality.[8]

Long before mid-century, Oxford and Cambridge were responding, therefore, to the new nineteenth-century context with a structure of examinations, but the increasing commitment to examinations was not without controversy and opposition. The accuracy of Cambridge's tripos ranking was challenged, as was the effect of examinations in 'vulgarizing the student's mind'.[9] The confidence in examinations, however, was strengthened by their introduction as selection mechanisms for the Indian and home civil service, their matriculation function, the professionalization of academic life. Departmental structures, reflecting the professional frontiers of subjects, sought credibility by demonstrating that the symbols of quality were comparable with those elsewhere. By 1903 Manchester's Senate had realized that the 'choice of a professor was perhaps the most important factor in the University's endeavour to establish and maintain the highest standards of scholarship'.[10] The machinery of judgment of subjects, professors, departments and universities included their ability to admit the 'right' students to share that scholarship, and to produce graduates who had demonstrably shared in it.

Colleges and universities were under increasing pressure in the late nineteenth century to meet various public, if nebulous, criteria of quality. This became particularly true when in 1889 Parliament first agreed a grant for university education, and appointed commissioners to advise on the institutions applying for a share. The Commissioners reported the following year that the Hartley Institution did not have 'a professional staff adequate for the complete teaching of university subjects' (and also that

there was no 'proper representative governing body'). A new Principal, other new appointments, funding from the County Borough Council of Southampton, and an increase in advanced work convinced the Commissioners in 1902 of progress and 'highly creditable' results, and an annual grant of £1000 was agreed by Parliament.[11] The elements of public accountability, as interpreted by institutions and their various outside constituencies, were beginning to assume a configuration to be familiar in the twentieth century. There are other elements that could be given greater prominence — including the elite social status of Oxford and Cambridge, the movements for their reform, and the forms of their responses, but the most important thread for any approach to standards, their definitions and guardianship in this period is that of the University of London.

The most important of these roles in the nineteenth century was the system of external degrees enshrined in its 1858 Charter. London had by that date, in the twenty-two years since its first Charter, 'affiliated' a scatter of institutions, inside and outside London. With the affiliation of Owens College the University of London decided to throw open access to its degrees without requiring students to have any institutional membership. Before 1858 the University 'possessed no visitorial authority and no right to enquire into the methods of teaching, or to effect improvements'. The sole means by which Senate could test the efficiency of the colleges, their courses and teaching, was the examination of their students. The 1858 Charter practically abolished the 'exclusive connection' of the University with the affiliated colleges.[12] It opened the degrees of the University to all students (except in medicine) 'irrespective of the place or manner of their education'.[13]

The colleges were left to concentrate in their own ways on preparing students for the London-controlled examination, and students could sit for them (both to matriculate for entry, and to graduate) at the colleges or other local centres — and the regulations governing the latter had to do entirely with costs and practical arrangements. The Charter enshrined the written examination as the ultimate test of the quality of the student and of the education received, and made it possible for colleges to develop under the auspices of its national currency. It was 'the most momentous innovation in higher education until the CNAA and the Open University',[14] 'the most momentous step ever taken in the history of the English universities'.[15]

The external degree soon, and throughout its history, raised questions about the appropriateness and justice of examinations divorced from teaching. While that separation looked attractive — including to American onlookers — as a guarantee of objectivity, students faced examinations whose standards were based on criteria often unrelated to, or in conflict with, those of the teaching situation. Owens College protested in 1872 at the 'unsuitable selection' sometimes made of topics for examination in

the Faculty of Arts. Questions were not only severe, but often bore no relation to what had been studied, with examiners trotting out 'their hobbies irrespective of teachers or taught'.[16] The currency of London's degrees, however, was to become international as well as national, and the fact that external students were subject to the same examiners as internal students was central to the acceptance of the degree standard. In 1898 under new Statutes London increased its involvement in those institutions admitted as schools of the University — including the right of visitation to monitor efficiency, and the approval of appointed teachers of the University. In other institutions the University could 'recognize' teachers, and where appropriate such institutions could enter students in certain fields and under certain conditions for internal degrees.[17]

The criteria of judgment were widening and incorporating new vocabularies. When the federal Victoria University was created in 1880, it was to admit colleges in towns such as Liverpool and Leeds if 'of adequate efficiency and stability'.[18]

The most important twentieth-century context for the discussion of standards was eventually to be the pressure for expansion following the Second World War. In the intervening half-century the elements of a 'higher education system' can be seen emerging. Other professional demands were being made, new universities and colleges were being created, with London continuing to define the standard of their external degrees until they achieved independence. Existing university colleges murmured from time to time about such independence, looking at the new universities which emerged from the break-up of Victoria University. The universities adjusted to new demands on their scholarship and resources from pressures for research, and the arrival in Britain of the PhD — with Oxford the first to accept it in 1917, and London the last two years later.[19] The UGC came into existence in 1919. The external examiner system became increasingly crystallized. The period ends after the Second World War with the establishment of the University College of North Staffs at Keele, the transition of some colleges to university status, and mounting pressures of demography, demand and higher technology. All of these have some bearing on issues of standards, but it is possible to emphasize only a few.

The first half-century produced a concern about the components of standards, as a result of diversification and growth. 'More means worse' was to be a slogan of the 1960s, but was part of the consciousness of earlier decades. Hull University College, for example, took its first students in 1928. In the same year a book on *The New Universities* took Hull as its illustration of what Britain did not need. Although a good case could be made out for it, Hull would herald 'a spate of new universities', which would either 'lower the standard of education in the universities that are

already in being ... or else they will form a new and surely unnecessary type, perhaps most like the American small town college... If English education and English standards of research are to be kept at their present level we do not want these small town colleges'.[20] A more complex hierarchy of institutions was being created — and interestingly from this example of opposition, research had become accepted as a hallmark of quality. Owens' elevation to university status had been helped considerably by its commitment to research on the European model,[21] and increasingly in the early decades of the twentieth century research was becoming an element in the judgment of university-level institutions. The inspectors appointed to supervise and report on the institutions receiving Treasury grants (prior to the establishment of the UGC) commented on research performance. Southampton's record was praised in 1909 as contributing to the intellectual life of the district, and in 1907 the inspectors commended Leeds for the contribution its technology, science teaching and research were making to Yorkshire industries.[22]

Quantity, quality and responsiveness to national and local needs were becoming issues. Hull provides a clear case. In a leaflet entitled *Why a University at Hull?* the College staked out its claim to be 'the centre of the intellectual and cultural life of the community which it serves', but at the same time the trustees had insisted that the area 'must have nothing less than the best'. The policy of quality before quantity would 'surely arouse the enthusiasm of every man and woman of vision in this proud corner of England'.[23] The following year the Principal described the College's awareness of 'the critical gaze of the existing University institutions' and its responsibilities 'in appealing for admission to the academic comity of the country'.[24] Justifying such an appeal in terms of standards was not easy. The new institutions had to contend with often poorly-qualified and ill-motivated students, some of whom had passed the Higher School Certificate and were exempt from the London Intermediate course and examination, but others of whom were not. Hull had to take steps for the former, providing extra work in preparation for final examinations, or advising students to 'choose to subject not taken for the Higher School Certificate'. More importantly, the College set up a 'Committee on Standards of Study', which, with the Principal in the chair, considered suggestions 'for raising the standard of work and for correcting the demeanour of the students'. Under the heading of 'Methods of study', the Committee set out some of the points to which the Principal was asked to draw students' attention at the beginning of each session, including: 'application to work generally', 'difference between College and school life', 'responsibility to their parents, to the people responsible for the payment of their fees, for proper use of scholarship funds', and 'organization of their work generally — attendance at lectures, compulsory attendance at

examinations . . .'. Heads of department would doubtless 'acquaint their students from time to time with the technique of examinations'.[25]

While the standard of students was in various respects problematic, so also was the quality of staff. Staff appointments have been called 'the moment of truth for universities',[26] and for the new institutions struggling to establish reputations, the question of staffing was often paramount. Hull in its early years was publicly apologetic that some of its departments would be headed by lecturers and not by professors. Under the London external degree system staff gained experience of teaching, but often not of examining, at degree level — and in the case of colleges like Exeter acquiring independence after the Second World War this was to prove a serious problem.[27] Victoria University and the universities which emerged from it provided a new base for fuller staff participation. In the schools of London University, as the University's 'inspectors' found on their visitations in the 1920s and 1930s, the staff was mostly one of 'distinction', as measured by 'the selection of publications, and tables of examination results' (in the case of Bedford College), and 'highly qualified and their record of research is good' (in the case of Westfield College).[28]

Such reports and the conditions they reflected have to be contrasted, however, with the problems of, for instance, Southampton, with students of uncertain quality and an overworked staff whose low salary scale 'meant that able young lecturers and assistant lecturers, as well as rising professors, frequently left for better-paid posts elsewhere which offered them greater facilities for individual work than the College yet possessed'.[29]

University institutions were now all being subjected, however discreetly, to forms of regular scrutiny. London's visitation procedures under the 1898 Statutes meant that not only were its own Schools being regularly inspected (the term 'inspectors' was still being used for its visiting teams until the late 1930s), but also the institutions with 'recognized teachers'. The visitors to Woolwich Polytechnic in 1938, for example, reported that an Academic Board had been set up (as recommended on the previous visitation in 1932). The seven recognized teachers covered a reasonable proportion of the final and higher degree work, and were either personally, or through supervision, responsible for 'a creditable amount of published research work' (though the library was inadequate). The visitors were impressed by the progress made in the previous five years, by 'the general standard of efficiency', and the 'satisfactory provision for the instruction of internal students and for the instruction of students pursuing courses of advanced study or research'.[30] The UGC, with its quinquennial visits, was at the same time promoting other processes of scrutiny and self-scrutiny. The universities reviewed their work in advance of a visit and considered priorities for the next five years. The UGC then made its judgments and estimated the institution's ability to carry out its proposals

— and gave the Treasury strategic advice. This process was scarcely concerned with standards in later understandings of the term. It was concerned more with subject range and balance, effective use of resources, and the avoidance (rarely successful) of competition. Within the universities

> the typical attitude of the majority of academics to the five year planning cycle was that it seemed a necessary chore in order to achieve a satisfactory submission to the UGC to enable the University to get its fair share (or more) of the allocation.[31]

Other considerations arose. The quality of campus life surfaced occasionally — as it had done since the creation of a university in London in the early nineteenth century had provoked anxieties about the temptations of the metropolis. Effective management and deployment of resources, and effective academic structures for the maintenance of teaching, scholarship and research, had indeed became part of the agenda. The ground rules for scrutiny and self-scrutiny were, however, never made clear, and the standards of judgment remained uncertain.

Examinations remained central. In its worries about student learning and behaviour in the 1930s Hull, like other institutions, was conscious of the judgments ultimately to be made of the College through its examination results — hence its anxieties about admission standards (including advice to students not to enter before they were 18) and examination technique.

Crucial for the development of the examination system, however, was the adoption of the 'external examiner' system, in order to guarantee equivalent, or at least comparable, standards. For institutions whose students sat for London's external degree, the 'external examiner' had always simply been one who taught and examined students in London's own Schools. From the beginning there were pressures from Owens College to have 'external and internal' examiners,[32] but these were aimed at enabling Owens' teachers to be involved in examining their own students. In the 1860s, amidst controversy about the desirability of new universities, the question of comparability with existing degrees was constantly raised, and in Owens' 1880 Charter, therefore, examinations loomed large. Students were to attend, would be taught, and would be examined by their teachers, but, 'as a concession to those who though there were moral or intellectual dangers in this combination, owing to favouritism or competition, external examiners were to be added'.[33] Bedford College, under the conditions of its Trust, employed men of 'high standing' in the University world to certify, as outside examiners, to the soundness of the education. This system of 'special examination from outside did much towards ensuring a sound standard of teaching within'.[34] The system continued until the

girls took London University and other examinations in the 1880s. In the first half of the twentieth century, however, the external examiner became as crucial to the concept of examination standards as London University's seal of quality through the external degree had been in the previous century.

All such attempts to establish and guarantee standards were put under strain, intensified and extended in the four decades which followed the Second World War. In the increasingly pervasive industrial culture and the international economic competition and uncertainties of much of this period higher education, in Britain as elsewhere, had to adapt to rapidly changing conditions of scale, structure, function and expectation. For higher education, old and new, in the 1960s especially, the paramount concern was 'incontrovertibly, to define and to clarify its function', within an industrial culture: 'how, then, to exemplify "concepts of excellence" within such a culture? No more important task faces the universities'.[35] Anxieties about standards, affecting a higher education expanding to incorporate larger numbers of students, newly-created and promoted institutions with different nomenclatures and awards, and curricula broadening to meet new demands, were made more and more explicit.

Throughout the 1950s and 1960s the UGC constantly faced such issues. Courses were becoming overloaded.[36] In conditions of expansion the quality of students and awards both needed to be watched. In 1953 the UGC welcomed increased numbers on condition tht they 'should not involve a decline in the standard reached by students when they obtain their first degree'. In 1958, following up this concern, it announced that work was in progress to assess numbers obtaining first-class degrees, numbers dropping out, and related information. In 1964, when the Colleges of Advanced Technology (CATs) were being proposed for university status, the UGC reported that its proposal had been accepted that each one should be given an Academic Advisory Committee 'for keeping under review the standard of the education provided in the university and of the degrees awarded'.[37]

Expansion brought opportunities, including those of *higher* standards in some people's view, since greater attention was being paid to many neglected aspects of education, but it brought defensive positions also. The Robbins Committee on higher education believed, in 1963, that numbers and quality could go together. Hoggart, two years later, agreed cautiously: 'I am in favour of expansion. I *think* it need not lower standards'.[38] Expansion placed everything under a microscope — admissions, staff appointments, research, courses (including for new awards such as the Diploma in Technology), examinations, resources, conditions for learning and living. At the heart of almost all debate was student demand, an issue which had captured academic discussion a decade before

Robbins. Sir John Wolfenden, addressing Reading University's Court in 1956, considered the by now familiar question, 'And what about standards?':

> I cannot get away from the elementary view that in fact at the present moment university standards ... throughout the universities as a whole, are dictated by the simple numerical fact of the number of university places there are. I suspect that there are very few university places left vacant on the ground that candidates of sufficient merit have not presented themselves...

He believed, though it is doubtful whether his was the prevailing view in the upper echelons of the universities, that 'to talk of "university standards" as if they represented something absolute, or even relatively permanent, is a misconception'.[39] The terms of the debate were very different from those of the earlier years of the century.

The terms changed markedly in relation to institutional status. The university colleges aspired to independent status against a background not only of current anxieties, but of historical attempts to define what constituted a university. At the end of the war Lord Eustace Percy had offered a definition: it must be 'a fully self-governing community of teachers and students, working together in one place, with substantial endowments of its own, mature enough to set its own standards of teaching and strong enough to resist outside pressures, public or private, political or economic'.[40] These and related criteria were a context in which Exeter or Leicester or Southampton sought independence. What they had to demonstrate was that escape from the London external degree would not result in a decline in standards. Southampton proposed a solution for the transition which proved acceptable both internally and to London University. London had established 'special relationships' as a temporary measure in the establishment of some overseas colleges, and Southampton proposed adopting a similar strategy. In 1948 the Principal, aware that 'there is bound to be a period of some anxiety for the College when we pass from the London external degree, with its established reputation, to a Southampton degree that has to justify itself to both the academic and the outer world', proposed a transitional arrangement. The College was to propose a date until which it would continue to prepare students for the external degree, and a period to follow during which, under the special relationship, 'students will pursue courses on syllabuses drawn up by the College and will take examinations conducted by the College supervised and assessed by London University'. These students would receive a London degree, but at the end of the period independent status under a Royal Charter would be sought. Southampton's Senate agreed this procedure in 1948, as did a joint committee of Senate and Council.[41] The

Senate of London University agreed the scheme, subject to Southampton's recognition by the UGC, and sufficient progress 'within a few years of obtaining a Charter for separate establishment as a University'.[42] The details were agreed, and the special relationship ended, in fact, only three years later when Southampton became an independent university. Using the same procedure, London agreed such an arrangement for Hull in 1952.[43]

Standards were from this point to be protected by a variety of such transitional and sponsorship arrangements. The post-war development of a University College in North Staffordshire was built on the notion of sponsorship, and when established at Keele the College was empowered to award its own degrees, but under the sponsorship of the universities of Oxford, Birmingham and Manchester — each of which, under the 1949 Charter, had two representatives on its Academic Council.[44] Similarly, in order to avoid institutional sponsorship, the UGC agreed with groups planning new universities at the end of the 1950s and early 1960s that they should have Academic Advisory Committees, to appoint the first Principal and professors, and to advise on the range of courses and standards.

When, in the 1960s, the Colleges of Advanced Technology achieved university status, the Academic Advisory Committees proposed by the UGC fulfilled similar transitional roles. Although there were variations in their interpretation of their roles, these were all concerned with such problems affecting the standards of the new institutions as their academic structure and the transfer of staff to university-grade posts.[45] They were also concerned with 'appropriate' curricula. The chairmen of the AACs met in 1964 to discuss a coherent approach, and agreed that the former CATs should retain a technological bias and their 'distinctive character' — for example, integrating course work and industrial training — and that they should resist the 'new university' model in the national interest.[46] The Chairman of the Chelsea College AAC, at the meeting at which this was reported, also commented on the debate taking place in the College about permanent or rotating heads of departments, and supported the governing body preference for permanent heads partly on the grounds that 'it would not be possible to find good candidates prepared to accept posts under a situation of rotating chairmanships and government by committee'.[47]

In such conditions the notion of standards — with very different emphases from, for example, those in the United States, with by now a strong voluntary accreditation tradition and the absence of an external examiner system — was arousing controversy across a widening spectrum of issues. In the 1960s especially, new meanings were being sought for concepts of standards or quality or excellence, which had once seemed absolute and measurable. The diverse elements of judgment were being

itemized. London University's admission of an institution was dependent on questions of government, quality and conditions of the staff, equipment, standard of instruction, and the number of students likely to proceed to degrees. The UGC had emphasized that the maintenance of standards depended among other things on the quality of life and education — as well as of the students'.[48] Senior university people were in the 1960s defining their positions. The maintenance of standards meant guaranteeing, for example, that students on completion of their courses had 'some familiarity with the basic ideas in a particular field of study', some experience of 'living and working with other people of similar ability in other fields of study', and were 'at least equal to others who have done the same course in earlier years'.[49] The maintenance of standards meant the ability and the wish to change.[50] The central implication, to be a dominant theme of the 1980s, was the means of evaluating or measuring the various components of such definitions. In Britain, as in the United States, there were to be attempts to distinguish between the quality of the educational process and the quality of graduates.[51] The Lindop enquiry into validation in the public sector of higher education was to emphasize the quality of the academic community,[52] and an analysis of 'higher education in a harsh climate' in 1983 was to look at 'the quality of teaching', 'the quality of student assessment' and 'the quality of teachers'.[53] All such itemization had roots in the shift to the wider questions raised by the changes of context and scale.

Although considerations of standards have so far focussed on university processes and understandings, the major change heralded by the post-war developments was the direct and continuing concern of the newly-designated public sector institutions of higher education, and the processes of validation and review which they promoted. The National Council for Technological Awards and its successor in 1964 — the Council for National Academic Awards — were urgently confronted with the need to establish that the DipTech and then the CNAA's degrees were, in the words of the CNAA's Statutes, 'comparable in standards to awards granted and conferred by universities',[54] though this made the questionable assumption that 'the latter comprise a single, indivisible entity'.[55] The polytechnics designated at the end of the 1960s needed to attain, redefine and demonstrate standards in very different institutional contexts. They were oriented, in the view of one principal, 'to a quite different concept of excellence to the academic one'.[56]

The relationship between the polytechnics and the CNAA was the pivot of the new approach, largely through the operation of peer evaluation and review. The press was continually to report on CNAA judgments about standards raised, or adverse reports which put courses or institutions at risk. Summing up the position after a decade, Eric Robinson

wrote: 'recalling experiences of degree courses in technical colleges in the fifties, I marvel at the advances in standards and status that have been made'. Weaknesses in the polytechnics were weaknesses of 'the whole of academia at the present time'.[57]

As evaluation processes took shape — including for the colleges and institutes of higher education from the mid-1970s — comparisons between the accountability measures of the 'public' sector and the invisible or inexplicit ones of the universities became more frequent. Comparing the CNAA system with university standards was questionable 'since who evaluates and establishes the standards of universities with which these comparisons are to be made?'. Testing one half of the binary system in this way was 'irrational and unscholarly'.[58]

The universities which engaged in validation from the 1970s were unable to make their evaluation processes and standards as explicit as those of the CNAA, and many, for various reasons, abandoned the field to the CNAA during the first decade of validation of the colleges of higher education. The CNAA, on the other hand, had constantly to reassert its commitment to acceptable, publicly-validated standards, however difficult it was to do so with any precision. Its guidance to institutions on the new Diploma of Higher Education contained a section on 'standards' which indicated:

> ... it has been necessary to establish a standard for the validation of the Diploma and this has been set for DipHEs validated by the CNAA at a level comparable to two years of a full-time course ... Validating parties may therefore be expected to evaluate proposals against this standard. The criteria will include content and process as well as the personal and intellectual challenge which the course makes upon the student ... this does not represent an absolute standard since it must be read in a context of different honours degree course patterns.[59]

The Lindop enquiry into public sector validation reported — whatever the pros and cons of CNAA validation procedures — that 'the standards being achieved on degree courses are generally satisfactory and in many cases excellent'. Welcoming this judgment, the National Advisory Body for Public Sector Higher Education (NAB) paid tribute to 'the CNAA's contribution to this achievement', seeing in it confirmation of the NAB's previously expressed view:

> Its insistence on rigorous documentation, specification of objectives and course structures, and compliance with standard regulations, together with its pressures for adequate resourcing research and staff development, and institutional self-evaluation have been

> instrumental in the fulfilment of its statute that the Council's degrees should be comparable in standard to those awarded by universities.[60]

The CNAA had become involved in course evaluation at a time when curricula were under strain. The new universities had often broadened and remodelled a traditional curriculum which had been criticized as haphazard, excellent in detail but the product of inertia and the pressures of subject imperialism,[61] criticisms to be frequently echoed in US debates about standards in the 1980s. Problems of course structure included the implications of breadth and joint degrees — as a Nuffield enquiry discovered in the mid-1970s[62] — and a growing rejection of the separation of honours and general degrees. Southampton, for instance, reported to the UGC that its faculties of Arts and Science were strongly opposed to general and honours tracks, and intended to abolish them.[63] At Leeds, before the war, Sir Michael Sadler had tried to persuade staff that '"ordinary" and "honours" were different in kind but *not* in standard',[64] but the belief had become increasingly untenable everywhere.

The 'container revolution' that the Nuffield enquiry described in higher education applied particularly to 'modular' and 'unit' courses. The attempt to restructure in some polytechnics along these lines was intended to provide wider choice and avoid the problems of 'finals'. The Nuffield enquiry found that the new structures produced little in the way of examination novelty — merely more frequent traditional examinations.[65] Modular courses were criticized as conforming to a model being rejected in favour of more effective ones in the United States.[66] The need for 'continuous assessment' to be built in was asserted — though not always with much clarity about the nature of such assessment.[67] Institutions were aware, however, that modular courses had to conform to the CNAA's conception of standards. Oxford Polytechnic, for example, adopted complex processes to monitor the programme, the teaching, assessment standards within and across modules, student performance and other features. It evolved a termly and annual review, occasional analysis in detail across a number of years, the appointment of a Modular Course Evaluation Officer, and a variety of other measures. By 1985 it was analyzing in depth such aspects as the relationship between larger course enrolments (as a result of economy measures) and average marks, disparities in marking across subjects, and average marks per module across time.[68] The Polytechnic was seeking to provide 'the maximum amount of choice compatible with the maintenance of academic standards', and incorporating a 'progressive mode of assessment (based on periodic hurdles rather than a final high jump)'.[69] No approach to standards prior to the 1960s had involved so many explicit elements.

The quality of staff and of teaching was also receiving attention, more tentatively, and with fewer criteria to apply. In 1985 the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals (CVCP) underlined that there had been little attempt by the universities to appraise staff regularly, and recommended an annual review.[70] One of the traditions of British universities had, in general, been a studied avoidance of confronting the quality of their teaching. Oxford and Cambridge were described in the 1960s as being, paradoxically, 'not really interested in education', indifferent to teaching methods, with 'a complete absence of curiosity about the effects of examinations', and a 'purely anecdotal attitude to the psychology of the learning process'.[71] Points of change were becoming visible. The Hale report on university teaching methods did not produce major change in practice or consciousness, but it did signal a move towards a more public process of evaluation and staff development. In a discussion of the report Lionel Elvin mentioned that five years previously, in a discussion of the same subject, 'a distinguished professor told us that we were not teachers; we were scholars willing to share our scholarship with the more promising of the young... After five years the mood has changed'.[72] By 1982 a *Times Higher Education Supplement* leader could proclaim that 'We are all teachers now'.[73] The criteria in use operationally were changing rapidly as new requirements had to be met. In 'vocational' higher education industrial or other experience was part of the measure of staff effectiveness.[74] In teacher training and other appointments some combination of the professional and the academic was increasingly required. While it was possible to analyze teacher characteristics, the question still remained — 'Is it possible to assess teaching?'.[75]

What had emerged, therefore, was an increasingly complex concern with quality control. Examinations, for so long the pillars of the standards edifice, were being viewed with suspicion from some directions. Robbins evaded the issues of the reliability and merits of examinations ('we are aware that there is a good deal of current discussion of these matters') by recommending research and exchange of experience — with a particularly clear role reserved for the future CNAA.[76] The reliability of examinations and marks had been challenged in the 1930s, with Hartog and Rhodes demonstrating the fragility of the standards applied in written examinations. Various techniques proposed to improve marking reliability had not silenced anxieties about differences amongst subjects, and within subjects from year to year.[77] Dale in 1959 castigated staff for their ignorance of the pitfalls of examining, and their belief that they carried in their heads an absolute standard of 40 per cent. He pointed particularly to the wide disparities of first class honours awards in different subjects, ranging from one in four in applied science to one in seventy in arts.[78] Williams pointed to a decade of uninvestigated, substantial disparities in marking at the

University of Leeds.[79] What was being discovered was 'The complexity of the assessment task'.[80] By the 1980s the same reservations were appearing regarding the role of the external examiner, whose presence did not appear to guard against arbitrary differences, and whose experience of 'comparability' was questionable, since course variations were too great and 'strictly speaking, no one group of students ever has an exactly identical performance requirement for all its members. The variations between different groups ... are naturally even greater'.[81] In the late 1950s and 1960s there was support for the introduction of 'objective tests' as in the United States,[82] but resistance was too great.

Alternatives were sought — including in some cases a call for the abandonment of examinations. Discussion frequently focussed on continuous assessment, its justice and dangers. In 1960 Wrigley argued against the belief that continuous assessment might cause standards to fall, being represented as a '"soft option", demanding less work from students. In fact the opposite might happen'.[83] Radical opinion went further. Failure rate fluctuations meant that examinations were 'a random process of selection'. The issue was how to make education a process of discourse 'between staff and students ... conducted between equals in terms of power... The aim must be to overthrow the university "management" and replace it by a democratic power'.[84] An anarchist group at University College, London, pointed to examinations as unreliable, a cause of suicides, serving social not academic purposes. Continuous assessment was no better: employers should conduct their own entrance examinations and leave universities free to teach what they wished.[85]

By the 1970s the examination 'revolution' of the previous century had became part of a broad search for appropriate forms of evaluation. Styles of evaluation were under constant discussion,[86] and even proponents of new forms of evaluation — including the 'illuminative' — were anxious that they should not become an excuse for lax standards.[87] Measures, their targets and what they reflected were more widely examined.[88] Size of unit became a factor — in the planning of the polytechnics, for example: 'many departments and colleges are too small to sustain high academic standards'.[89] Sheila Browne underlined, when offering advice on quality to the National Advisory Body for Public Sector Higher Education, that just as quality was 'neither absolute nor static, so its components will vary according to the area of study and the purpose of the qualification sought'.[90] The NAB itself in 1984, in compiling a table of quality indices that might be applied to programmes and institutions, emphasized 'the essentially subjective nature of a quality judgment'.[91]

While the range of approaches was applied to the internal and external procedures of validation, it only rarely was so in the case of the

universities themselves, whose course control mechanisms remained enormously varied, difficult to ascertain or unexplored.[92]

Only rarely also have universities submitted themselves to external review. They have reluctantly admitted Her Majesty's Inspectors to scrutinize their teacher education (without public report as in the public sector), and have accepted 'accreditation' (not validation, the CVCP has made clear) by professional bodies, with the universities protecting their responsibility 'as autonomous bodies ... for the academic standards of their own degree courses'. Accreditation has been confined to 'the training element of a course', to give students exemption from the examinations of the professional bodies.[93] Outside review has been at times of crisis. Stirling University commissioned an independent report on the policies and running of the University following disturbances in October 1972.[94] Chelsea College invited extensive peer review (by Fellows of the Royal Society) following damaging criticism of the College by the Swinnerton-Dyer Committee on the rationalization of London University.[95]

Alongside these processes have gone attempts to establish performance indicators of many kinds, not without controversy and difficulty.[96] Sustained attempts have been made to correlate student performance at school and university examinations. Judgments about the quality of students' experience of, and performance in, higher education have remained elusive since, as Sheila Browne points out, real evidence about that quality 'lies in the subsequent performance of the student'.[97] In all of these cases the answers have indeed proved difficult to catch. Absolute or comparable standards have been elusive particularly as the system, whatever its expansions and contractions, has remained hierarchical — although with interlocking and complex hierarchies.The traditional social and intellectual hierarchies have remained intact, whilst adapting to hierarchies established by new universities, new styles of academic life and community, new sectors, new statuses of subjects and graduate employment. The roles of government, paymasters and moderators of standards have changed, new bodies and roles have emerged. When *The Times Higher Education Supplement* produced a series of articles on quality control in October–December 1982, it looked at the CNAA, polytechnics, HMIs, Regional Advisory Councils, external examiners, course approval mechanisms in universities, students' and heads of departments' views, the Open University, American ranking of institutions, BTEC, and evaluation in professional scientific institutions.

Accusations of elitism have doubtless been confirmed by the ways in which quality questions have been addressed — given the problem of reconciling standards and quality with wider constituencies of students. This was an issue, in different forms, and with different target groups,

60

when London University was created, when the university colleges were created, and when the system expanded after the Second World War. The main controversies around the notion of standards have related essentially to expanded student access, and recent tensions around questions of quality and equality in Britain and elsewhere have simply revived old themes. One of the most telling comments on this tension is contained in the diaries of R.H. Tawney, an extract from which was added by *Universities Quarterly* to its 1969 report of a conference on 'Concepts of excellence':

> . . . the business of the university is twofold: to uphold an intellectual standard and to uphold a moral standard. The intellectual standard it upholds by maintaining a severe intellectual discipline; the moral standard it upholds by making that discipline accessible to all who will submit to it — by relaxing it for none merely because they are well-to-do or socially influential, by depriving none of it merely because they are poor or uncouth or socially incompetent.[98]

Identifying, defining and relating all the elements in such an analysis or in an updated version in changed and changing circumstances, has never ceased to be difficult, 'and this is possibly inevitable'. It helps to explain why the processes themselves are not simple, and why the tension between national policy-making and institutional policy processes is not straightforward. What the story illustrates, in fact, is a criss-cross of policy tensions, between quality and access, between internal and external measures of quality and success, and between the kaleidescope of partners engaged in and related to the processes of higher education.

'Policy' in this case links, on the one hand, the procedures of civil society, the components of its political and economic pressures and demands, and on the other hand the ways in which institutions define and conduct their operations. It is important at this point, in fact, to emphasize that policy-making and the analysis of policy are not the prerogative of governments and analysts of government behaviour.

Acknowledgments

The Nuffield Foundation funded the research of which this chapter is one of the outcomes. Pamela Silver shared in the research and co-authored the original version. Clem Adelman, Keith Hoskin and David Watson made helpful comments during the research and drafting. Sam Crook made possible access to material relating to London University's external de-

grees, and the archivists of Southampton and Hull Universities gave invaluable assistance.

Notes

1 Banting, K. (1979) *Poverty, Politics and Policy: Britain in the 1960s*, London, Macmillan, p. 4.
2 The University College of Southampton, *Handbook for the Session 1915–16* (file LF 783. 2 Univ. Coll.), p. 24.
3 Vickers, K.H. (1942) *Looking Back and Looking Forward* (report by the Principal), (LF 780 UNI), p. 20.
4 Anon. (1836) *Metropolitan University. Remarks on the Ministerial Plan of a Central University Examining Board*, London, Effingham Wilson, p. 4.
5 Hoskin, K. (1979) 'The examination, disciplinary power and rational schooling', *History of Education*, 8, 2, p. 144.
6 Rothblatt, S. (1968) *The Revolution of the Dons: Cambridge and Society in Victorian England*, London, Faber & Faber (Cambridge University Press edn), p. 182.
7 Thompson, J. (1886) *The Owens College: Its Foundation and Growth; and Its Connection with the Victoria University, Manchester*, Manchester, Cornish, pp. 141–2.
8 Ben-David, J. (1977) *Centers of Learning: Britain, France, Germany, United States*, New York, McGraw-Hill, p. 55.
9 Sir John Seeley, in Sanderson, M. (Ed.) (1975) *The Universities in the Nineteenth Century*, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, pp. 112–3.
10 Charlton, H.B. (1951) *Portrait of a University 1851–1951*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, p. 35.
11 Hartley University College, Southampton, *Calendar for the Session 1905–6* (LF 782.2 Univ. Coll.), pp. 16–17.
12 University of London (1912) *The Historical Record (1836–1912)*, London, University of London Press, pp. 11–12.
13 Committee of Enquiry into the Governance of the University of London (1972) *Final Report*, London, University of London, p. 5.
14 Lawson, J. (1975) 'Higher education before Robbins', *Aspects of Education*, 18, p. 8.
15 Simmons, J. (1959) *New University*, Leicester, Leicester University Press, p. 21.
16 Thompson, J. (1886) *op cit*, p. 517.
17 University of London (1912) *op cit*, pp. 83 and 87.
18 Lawson, J. (1975) *op cit*.
19 Simpson, R. (1983) *How the PhD Came to Britain: A Century of Struggle for Postgraduate Education*, Guildford, Society for Research into Higher Education.
20 Herklots, H.G.G. (1928) *The New Universities: An External Examination*, London, Benn, p. 88.
21 Charlton, H.B. (1951) *op cit*, p. 55.
22 Patterson, A.T. (1962) *The University of Southampton: A Centenary History*, Southampton, University of Southampton, p. 126; Shimmin, A.N.

(1954) *The University of Leeds: The First Half Century*, London, Cambridge University Press, pp. 73–4.

23 Hull University College (1929) *Why a University at Hull?*, Hull, Hull University College (file ULD 335 H9 Rev E6747), pp. 1–3.

24 Hull University College (1930) *The University of Hull: What It Is and What It Does*, Hull, Hull University College (ULD 335 H9 Rev E6749), pp. 1–2.

25 University College of Hull, Committee on Standards of Study, Minutes of first meeting ... 21 May 1931, mimeo (V.C. 34).

26 Christopherson, D.G. (1967) 'Standards — the concept of excellence', *The British Universities Annual 1967*, London, Association of University Teachers, p. 107.

27 Clapp, B.W. (1982) *The University of Exeter: A History*, Exeter, University of Exeter, p. 123.

28 University of London (1936) *Visitation under Statute 114. Bedford College. Report of Inspectors* (with Senate Minutes, A.C.6); (1936) *Visitation under Statute 14. Westfield College. Report of Inspectors* (with Senate Minutes, A.C.7).

29 Patterson, A.T. (1962) *op cit*, p. 185.

30 University of London (1938) *Inspection under Statute 125. The Woolwich Polytechnic — Report of Inspectors* (with Senate Minutes A.C.3).

31 West, J.C. (1981) 'The potential of periodic review for institutional renewal — the universities' view', in Manchester Polytechnic Staff Development Unit (Ed.) *Measuring up to the Future: institutional evaluation and renewal*, Manchester, Manchester Polytechnic, pp. 18–20.

32 Thompson, J. (1886) *op cit*, p. 158.

33 Fiddes, E. (1937) *Chapters in the History of Owens College and of Manchester University 1851–1914*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, p. 80.

34 Tuke, M.J. (1939) *A History of Bedford College for Women 1849–1937*, London, Oxford University Press, pp. 122–3.

35 Betsky, S. (1969) 'Concepts of excellence: Universities in an industrial culture', *Universities Quarterly*, 24, 1, p. 7.

36 University Grants Committee (1953) *University Development: Report on the Years 1947 to 1952*, London, HMSO, pp. 45–6; University Grants Committee (1958) *University Development 1952–1957*, London, HMSO, pp. 37–9.

37 UGC (1953) *op cit*, p. 22; UGC (1958) *op cit*, pp. 20–1; UGC (1964) *University Development 1957–1962*, London, HMSO, p. 106.

38 Hoggart, R. (1965) *Higher Education and Cultural Change: A Teacher's View*, Newcastle, University of Newcastle upon Tyne, p. 3.

39 Holt, J.C. (1977) *The University of Reading: The First Fifty Years*, Reading, Reading University Press, p. 327.

40 Simmons, J. (1959) *op cit*, p. 162.

41 University College of Southampton (1948) Joint Development Committee, Minutes and papers (LF 780 UNI), (R.S.W. three mimeo documents).

42 University of London, *Minutes of Senate*, 24 June 1949 (item 31: University College, Southampton — Special application).

43 University of London, *Minutes of Senate*, 23 July 1952 (item 49: University College, Hull — Special application).

44 Mountford, J. (1972) *Keele. An Historical Critique*, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, pp. 68–81.

45 Venables, P. (1978) *Higher Education Developments: The Technological Universities 1956–1976*, London, Faber & Faber, pp. 57–61.

46 Chelsea College of Science and Technology, Report of the Seventh Meeting of the Academic Advisory Committee ... 28 January 1965, mimeo, p. 1.
47 *ibid.*, p. 2.
48 UGC (1948) *University Development from 1935 to 1947*, London, HMSO, p. 35.
49 Christopherson, D.G. (1967) *op cit*, p. 106.
50 Butterworth, in *Universities Quarterly*, 'Concepts of excellence 1969–1989, reports of a conference, January 1969', 23, 3, p. 259.
51 Crombag, H.F.M. (1978) 'On defining quality of education', *Higher Education*, 7, 4; Adelman, C. (1983) 'The major seventh: Standards as a leading tone in higher education' in Warren, J.R. (Ed.) *Meeting the New Demand for Standards*, San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass.
52 Committee of Enquiry into the Academic Validation of Degree Courses in Public Sector Higher Education (1985) *Academic Validation in Public Sector Higher Education* (The Lindop Report), London, HMSO.
53 Williams, G. and Blackstone, T. (1983) *Response to Adversity: Higher Education in a Harsh Climate*, Guildford, Society for Research into Higher Education.
54 Council for National Academic Awards (1983) *Handbook of CNAA's Policy and Regulations*, London, CNAA, p. 11.
55 Taylor, W. (1979) 'Degrees of excellence', *Times Higher Education Supplement*, 23 November, p. 27.
56 Brosan in *Universities Quarterly*, 'Concepts of excellence', p. 263.
57 Robinson, E. (1979) 'The "people's universities": A progress report', *Times Higher Education Supplement*, 14 December, pp. 13–14.
58 Davey, W. (1971) 'Distrust of polytechnic standards "irrational and unscholarly"', *Times Higher Education Supplement*, 15 October, p. 17.
59 Council for National Academic Awards (n.d.) *Diploma of Higher Education*, London, CNAA, p. 4.
60 National Advisory Body for Public Sector Higher Education (1985) 'Response to the Lindop report', *NAB Bulletin*, summer, p. 14.
61 Sir Livingstone, R. (1948) *Some Thoughts on University Education*, London, Cambridge University Press, p. 12.
62 Nuffield Foundation Group for Research and Innovation in Higher Education (1974) 'Broader education', *Newsletter*, 4; Nuffield Foundation (1975) *The Drift of Change: An Interim Report of the Group for Research and Innovation in Higher Education*, London, Nuffield Foundation.
63 University of Southampton (1960) *Visit of the University Grants Committee, December 1960* (draft documentation for Senate, 29 June) (file UGC Visit, 1960, Correspondence and Papers) 5, 13.
64 Shimmin, A.N. (1954) *op cit*, *The University of Leeds*, pp. 72–3.
65 Mansell, T. *et al.* (1976) *The Container Revolution: A Study of Unit and Modular Courses*, London, Nuffield Foundation, pp. 30–1.
66 Church, C.H. (n.d.) 'Modular courses in British higher education: A critical assessment', Lancaster University, mimeo, pp. 4–11.
67 Quinn, T.F.J. (1978) 'A critical appraisal of modular courses and their relevance to the British system of higher education', *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 9, 1.
68 Oxford Polytechnic (1983) *Application to the Council for National Academic Awards for Renewal and Approval of the Modular Courses: Central Volume*; Oxford Polytechnic (1985) 'Modular courses: Summary of results of module

examinations for academic year 1984–85 all terms', mimeo; LINDSAY, R.O. and PATON, R. (1985) 'Effects of changes in higher education on the modular course — 1981–2 — 1984–5', Oxford Polytechnic, mimeo.

69 WATSON, D. (1985) 'The Oxford Polytechnic modular course 1973–83: A case study', *Journal of Further and Higher Education*.

70 Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals (1985) *Report of the Steering Committee for Efficiency Studies in Universities*, London, CVCP, pp. 28–9.

71 ROSE, J. and ZIMAN, J. (1964) *Camford Observed*, London, Gollancz, pp. 228–9.

72 Home Universities Conference (1965) *Report of Proceedings 1964*, London, Association of Commonwealth Universities, p. 32.

73 *Times Higher Education Supplement*, 'We are all teachers now', 7 May 1982, p. 32.

74 LOCKE, M. (1970) *Traditions and Controls in the Making of a Polytechnic: Woolwich Polytechnic 1890–1970*, London, Thames Polytechnic, p. 126.

75 ELTON, L.R.B. (1975) 'Is it possible to assess teaching?' in University Teaching Methods Unit (Ed.) *Evaluating Teaching in Higher Education*, London, UTMU.

76 Committee on Higher Education (1963) *Higher Education. Report*, London, HMSO, p. 189.

77 COX, R. (1967) 'Examinations and higher education: A survey of the literature', *Universities Quarterly*, 21, 3.

78 DALE, R.R. (1959) 'University standards', *Universities Quarterly*, 13, 2; PHILLIPS, E.G. (1959) 'University standards', *Universities Quarterly*, 13, 3.

79 WILLIAMS, W.F. (1979) 'The role of the external examiner in first degrees', *Studies in Higher Education*, 4, 2, p. 168.

80 MILLER, C. and PARLETT, M. (1973) *Up to the Mark: A Research Report on Assessment*, Edinburgh, University of Edinburgh, chapter 3.

81 TURNER, D.J. (1985) 'An analysis of differences in marks obtained by students in different modules', *Teaching* (Oxford Polytechnic), no. 12, pp. 12–15; BEE, M. and DOLTON, P. (1985) 'Degree class and pass rates: An inter-university comparison', *Higher Education Review*, 7, 2; BECHER, T. and KOGAN, M. (1980) *Process and Structure In Higher Education*, London, Heinemann, p. 157.

82 DALE, R.R. (1959) *op cit*; COOPER, B. and FOY, J.M. (1967) 'Examinations in higher education — A review', *Journal of Biological Education*, 1, 2; OPPENHEIM, A.N., JAHODA, M. and JAMES, R.L. (1967) 'Assumptions underlying the use of university examinations', *Universities Quarterly*, 21, 3.

83 WRIGLEY, J. (1965) 'Measuring the mind' in GORDON, P. (Ed.) (1980) *The Study of Education: A Collection of Inaugural Lectures*, London, Woburn Press, p. 311.

84 FAWTHROP, T. (1969) 'Education or examination?' in COCKBURN, A. and BLACKBURN, R. (Eds) *Student Power. Problems, Diagnosis, Action*, Harmondsworth, Penguin, pp. 99–102.

85 BUTTERWORTH, B. and POWELL, A. (n.d.) *Marked for Life: A Criticism of Assessment at Universities*, London, University College London Anarchist Group.

86 BECHER, T. and KOGAN, M. (1980) *op cit*, pp. 149–51.

87 STENHOUSE, L. (1979) 'The problems of standards in illuminative research', *Scottish Educational Review*, 11, 1.

88 CROMBAG, H.F.M. (1978) *op cit*.

89 Department of Education and Science (1966) *A Plan for Polytechnics and Other Colleges*, London, HMSO, p. 5.
90 BROWNE, S. (1984) 'NAB and "quality"', *Higher Education Review*, 17, 1, p. 45.
91 National Advisory Body for Local Authority Higher Education (1984) 'Quality', London, NAB, mimeo, p. 5.
92 CHURCH, C.H. (1983) 'Course control in the university sector' in CHURCH, C.H. (Ed.) *Practice and Perspective in Validation*, Guildford, Society for Research into Higher Education, pp. 61–4.
93 Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals (1984) *External Involvement in Maintenance and Monitoring of Academic Standards*, London, CVCP, p. 6.
94 YOUNG, R. (1973) 'Report on the policies and running of Stirling University from 1966–1973', Stirling, mimeo.
95 *Times Higher Education Supplement*, 'Chelsea ranks with the best, say academics', 11 December 1981, p. 4.
96 BEVAN, J.S. (1984) 'The inter-relationship and impact of performance criteria for higher education', London, mimeo; BILLING, D. (Ed.) (1980) *Indicators of Performance*, Guildford, Society for Research into Higher Education; LINDSAY, A. (1981) 'Assessing institutional performance in higher education: a managerial perspective', *Higher Education*, 10, 6; SIZER, J. (1981) 'Indicators of institutional performance' in Manchester Polytechnic Staff Development Unit (Ed.) *Measuring up to the Future: Institutional Evaluation and Renewal*, Manchester, Manchester Polytechnic.
97 BROWNE, S. (1984) *op cit*, p. 45.
98 TAWNEY, R.H. (1969) extract from diaries, in *Universities Quarterly*, 'Concepts of excellence 1969–1989', 23, 3, p. 319.

Chapter 4

Public Sectors of Higher Education: Versions of Accountability

Only in the last few years, and under various kinds of extreme pressure, has the full measure of changes worldwide in the landscape of higher education begun to be taken. Lingering, older anxieties about liberal learning, technology, professional training or academic freedom, have been replaced or redefined with reference to accountability, rationalization, planning, coordination, control, responsiveness, the entrepreneurial university, and self-defensive positions and rivalries. The concept of 'higher education' itself is crucial to understanding the nature of the changes, and it is important in doing so to step outside the particular economic and political pressures of the 1980s.

The term 'higher education' became common currency in Britain as an overall diagram containing a number of constituent parts only in the early 1960s, largely through the remit given to the Robbins Committee in 1961 'to review the pattern of full-time higher education in Great Britain', and then in the use of the term for the Committee's report.[1] Even in 1960, the report of the Anderson Committee on *Grants to Students* did not use the term, restricting itself to the use, as independent concepts, of 'universities', 'higher technical education', and 'comparable courses' in 'further education establishments' maintained by local authorities.[2] Robbins accepted unquestioningly that it was concerned with a pattern of higher education, as did the submissions to the Committee and responses to it. Not that the pattern was necessarily to be one of equivalences: as the Association of University Teachers (AUT) told the Committee, most university teachers took it for granted that in the period of expansion there would be 'a need for some courses which will differ from present university courses by being wider in scope and lower in standard'.[3] The brief government White Paper in the month following the Robbins Report took it for granted that the discussion was about 'higher education places in universities, technical colleges and training colleges', and accepted the committee's recommendation that a Council for National Academic

Awards should be established to administer 'degree courses for students in non-university institutions'.[4] In the conditions of the early 1960s a pattern of 'higher education' was becoming the focus of debate, and was to produce its own new controversies — as well as the *Times Higher Education Supplement* in 1971.

The conceptual changes, though not their implications, were more important in Britain than in the United States. At the time of Robbins the American journal *Higher Education* (an official publication of the Office of Education in Washington) was already into its nineteenth volume, and the regular use of the concept in the United States reflected the broader university and college base already in existence, with its mix of public and private institutions, an already major role in higher education for the individual states, and attempts to extend the narrow base of federal involvement in higher education. A 'Higher Education Facilities Act', passed by Congress two months after the publication of the Robbins Report in Britain, was designed to give assistance to 'institutions of higher education, including graduate and undergraduate institutions, junior and community colleges, and technical institutes'.[5]

Within older and newer vocabularies and directions in both countries the 1960s brought substantial higher education changes, and it is largely the meaning of those changes in the United States and Britain that it is important to explore here, bringing the argument closer to the sources of public policy pressures. The higher education processes involved reach back at least into the mid and late nineteenth century, and forward into some of the dominant policies and issues in both countries. The interest in both cases is the creation or crystallization of what in Britain was termed the 'public sector', the sector which grew out of the 'binary' policy superimposed on the Robbins thinking in the late 1960s, and intended among other things to be parallel with the universities and more directly accountable to public authorities — local authorities, the Department of Education and Science (DES), and in the 1980s the National Advisory Body (NAB) — replaced in 1988 by the Polytechnics and Colleges Funding Council (PCFC). It is the directness of that relationship that initially brought questions of the nature of a 'non-autonomous' sector of higher education into the centre of attention, alongside related questions regarding the functions of the CNAA and the ultimate influence of the binary policy on both sides of the 'binary line'. In the United States the focus here is the growth of an increasingly systematized network of state-controlled or state-coordinated colleges and universities, and the more clear demarcation in the American case in this century between 'state' institutions on the one hand and private institutions on the other hand — though even here, particularly since the 1960s, some of the distinctions have been blurred.

In both countries, under the pressures of the late 1950s and 1960s to expand provision and access, there was a process of systematization, the creation of new institutions and the 'promotion' of others, the production or strengthening of more controllable 'alternative' systems, the greater incorporation of teacher education into a newly-defined higher education mainstream, a reexamination of the curriculum of higher education in relation to social demands. The partners, legislation, institutions, are different, but there are clearly recognizable similarities of direction, policy, problem and solution. The differences of system or scale are less important in this case than the demographic, political and other pressures which point to an emergent, parallel commitment to increasing access to higher education. In Britain, the forms of expansion and debate in the late 1950s and 1960s can be traced back at least in part to the history of collectivism and welfare statism, the pattern of public ownership, control and legislated responsibilities during and after the Second World War. The Robbins Committee on higher education can be explained to an extent by the strengths and weaknesses of those processes, as well as by other economic, demographic and ideological contexts of obvious importance. The post-war decades share with the 1980s a concern for centralized system making, but the forms, purposes and priorities are different. In the United States, the 1963 Act and other federal involvements of the mid-1960s were a product of the American liberal moment from the election of John F. Kennedy in 1961 to roughly the third year of Lyndon Johnson's presidency in 1966/67. The same demographic and other forces were at work, but without a historical acceptance of collectivism similar to that of Great Britain the expansion of provision was rooted much more in a political or even moral crusade.

Federal involvement in American higher education began most importantly with the land-grant colleges from the 1860s, later to become the first-generation of state universities — as when the Massachusetts State College became the University of Massachusetts in 1947. While it is true that at the federal level the United States did not indulge in system building, in many of the states in the nineteenth century strong central policies emerged and were implemented, as in the case of pioneering Michigan, which from the 1830s was determined not to leave education 'in the hands of competing poverty-stricken denominational academies and colleges', but to develop a 'controlled system of education, capped by a state university with a monopoly of power to confer degrees'.[6] So much were the new institutions seen as part of the state bureaucratic machine that there were strong complaints that officials saw no difference between control of the state universities and that of other aspects of state government; one complaint in 1913, for example, told of the University of

Nebraska being seen as part of state government on the same level as the state treasurer and other public offices.[7]

Of particular interest here, however, is the developmental path of teacher training, from the normal school to the state teachers' college, to the state college, and in many cases on to the second generation of state universities. Of the 279 member institutions of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (which consists entirely of this level of institution, and not the big land-grant universities), it was calculated in 1969 that 59 per cent began as normal schools or teachers colleges (the others having started as agricultural or technical institutes, junior colleges, academies or seminaries, religious schools or YMCAs, and in 10 per cent of cases directly as state colleges).[8] In their origins the normal schools, like the British teacher training colleges, were not perceived as 'higher education'. They were even defined and defended as different from college level education. The President of a state normal school in Missouri told his colleagues in 1914 (with what response is not known) that

> The twentieth-century normal school is a vocational institution. It is not a college. It is not much like a college, does not intend to become a college, never will be a college. Its work is not duplicated by colleges. It does not interfere with any exclusive function of any college, if any college has any such function ...

Its atmosphere, functions, facilities were in some respects different and in others better.[9] Strong though this separatist defence, however, within little more than a decade these extensions of the public school system were throughout the United States acquiring a new status. Between 1900 and 1936 143 new state universities and colleges appeared in the United States, most of them having started life as normal schools or more recently as state teachers colleges.[10] The interest of those who had sought to defend the identity of the normal school was now transferred to the protection of the identity of the new institutions as *teachers'* colleges,[11] and it was not until after the Second World War that wider ambitions most commonly became reflected in the change of title from state teachers' colleges to state colleges. The rhythm, the scale and the implications for coordination and control were not the same in the different states, but the pattern is clearly visible.

An illustration from one of the educationally less progressive states, Pennsylvania, is not very different from anything in other states. The Central State Normal School applied to be allowed to grant Bachelor of Science degrees in education in 1926, and success was reported to the Board of Trustees the following year. To achieve this, faculty without degrees had had to be replaced by others 'especially well equipped', a

370

close scrutiny had been conducted from Harrisburg, the state capital, and ability to award the degree would now mean, said the Principal, that 'the influences and opportunity of the school are widened and at the same time, the responsibility of the school is increased'. In 1927, therefore, it became a four-year State Teachers College.[12]

Until the Second World War the Pennsylvania state colleges went through a period of what one of their presidents later called a 'period of transition' from 'a State Teachers College (in name) to a State Teachers College (in fact)'.[13] In 1961 the President of Lock Haven State Teachers College (as the Central State Normal School had become) reported the next state of development to the Trustees, announcing that new state legislation permitted the colleges to offer four-year programmes in arts and sciences, as well as continuing to prepare teachers. The college once again had had to improve its staffing and reorganize its programme of studies. The new development in what was now Lock Haven College, said the President:

> follows the national trend from state normal schools to teachers colleges and then to multi-purpose state colleges.[14]

Pennsylvania had evolved a series of fourteen state colleges, and by an Act of the state legislature in 1982 they were eventually to be part of a fully-fledged 'state system of higher education', and when in 1983 Lock Haven was designated Lock Haven State University of Pennsylvania, the President informed the Trustees that an ice-cream celebration would be held on the lawn outside one of the domitories, to be followed by a formal celebration later.[15]

In Pennsylvania, as in other states, the pattern of responses was both to demographic pressures and to the growing post-war interpretation of higher education as a major ingredient of and force for democracy. The context is that of an approach to education which is exemplified well by a speech made to one of the regional accreditation agencies in 1953, when it was the comprehensive land-grant university that was central to expansionist attention as part of a new sense of a public education *system*:

> We are now well along the route toward a new and much broader definition of this generalized system. Both secondary and higher education are in process of being designed for all of the youth of the nation. The blooming, buzzing confusion called democracy has lost its taste for the caste system of continental society out of which our college patterns were secured. There simply had to be a democratization of education. . . .[16]

The expansion of American higher education in the 1950s and 1960s involved, of course, other things, and the history of the period has to look

at what was happening to the private institutions, to the expansion of institutions of many kinds, the GI Bill and other developments affecting funding and student access, experimental new institutions and experimental initiatives within established ones. It would need to incorporate an analysis of the rapid rise of the two-year post-secondary 'junior college' or 'community college', increasing in number, for example, from twenty to 207 across the United States between 1909/10 and 1922, and still increasing number by the beginning of the 1970s at the rate of fifty new community colleges a year.[17] The crucial element in our focus here is the fact that by the early 1960s the individual American states had evolved a relatively common pattern of four-year state colleges/universities, and — a point to which I shall return — a variety of methods of controlling or coordinating their activities, approving their programmes, monitoring their standards and other threads in the process of direct accountability.

The British processes by the early 1960s were dominated largely by the specific and exclusive interpretation of the nature and role of the 'university' as a degree-awarding institution. The story of the National Council for Technological Awards and the Colleges of Advanced Technology, both created in 1956, is basically one of the assumption of the rightness of that exclusive interpretation. The expressed purpose of the NCTA was to 'create and administer awards for students in technical colleges who complete to the satisfaction of the governing body such courses in technology as have been approved by the governing body'.[18] Its role was subject specific, the awards were not degrees, and the institutions were not universities and not colleges, but 'technical colleges'. Its founding document was not a charter, but a trust deed. The designation, from the ranks of the technical colleges, of ten CATs was an outcome of the post-war attempt to improve British technology, and of the assertion — not necessarily the demonstration — that there was a basic duality in the system. The 1956 White Paper on technical education, which embodied all of these proposals, talked of the training of technologists being 'shared between the universities and the technical colleges. Each has its own distinctive contribution to make . . .'.[19] What was really distinctive about the CATs was that they were ultimately seen as serving as an apprenticeship, and it was successfully completed in 1964 when they were transferred to the jurisdiction of the University Grants Committee (UGC), and over the next couple of years became universities or, in two cases, parts of federal universities.

The promotion of the CATs was a Robbins recommendation. The basic philosophy involved was outlined with great clarity by Robbins himself in a House of Lords debate at the end of 1965, where attention focussed on the new binary proposals. Robbins reflected on the committee's proposal for the new CNAA, 'not as a symbol of ultimate divorce, as

the Secretary of State seems to conceive it', but as a means of providing degrees for the many students who 'for years to come would not be able to obtain entry to university institutions'. Within diversity, he emphasized:

> we conceived of the system as unitary in the sense that it was flexible and evolutionary and that it contained no unnecessary barriers or limitations on growth and transformation. We emphasized the importance of the possible transfer of individuals and institutions from one sector to another.[20]

It is clear that the CATs fitted that model. Crosland's binary proposals did not. There were therefore two ways of building on the tradition of local authority further and technical education, one involving transfer upwards into a unitary sector, the other involving the construction of an alternative sector. The development of the concept of a British 'higher education' derives its crucial contours from that tension between the publication of the Robbins Report in 1963 and the emergence of a binary policy from 1965.

The Robbins Committee was faced, in England and Wales (and with only slight differences in Scotland) with a quadripartite diagram: the universities; the ambiguous CATs — which were in origins and provision unrelated to the universities, but which also had a long history of preparing for London University external degrees; the remainder of advanced further education in the 'public' sector; and the teacher training colleges. As in the United States, there were pressures towards and away from these colleges raising their status, making teaching a graduate profession, broadening the curriculum of the colleges. There were, by the 1960s, decades of past debate about their relationships with the universities. An outcome of the Robbins Report was a change of name to colleges of education, and the introduction of a Bachelors' degree in education. The trajectory of these colleges paralleled that of the American ones, but by the early 1960s the British colleges were still a decade away from the developments which would give them the impetus and the opportunity to become multi-purpose. In the mid-1970s they were, in fact, to move on to the track that would turn them, not into state colleges or universities, but colleges of higher education, sharing the alternative system with the polytechnics, and not without tension between these two sub-constituencies of the sector. None of these institutions seems on any occasion to have held an ice-cream celebration.

British national policy-making and planning and the state-wide versions of those in the United States have important features in common, and both occurred across decades where demographic and political pressures pointed towards increased student access, towards planned growth, and — once the binary policy began to be implemented in Britain —

towards a significantly greater measure of direct and explicit public accountability. The efforts in both situations to create new structures or alternative routes raised major questions not only of organization, administration, finance and control, but also of purpose and curriculum, relations with the labour market, vocationalism, and in general what the Americans mean by 'mission'. When the colleges of higher education diversified in the late 1970s, they were occupying in many respects ground also containing the American state colleges — and some not dissimilar institutions in other countries — Germany and Australia for example.

The American state-wide sectors of higher education took their decisive shapes in the 1960s. Although it is important to remember the diverse origins and configurations of many of these institutions and sectors, the basic thrust was a common one. As the President of the State University of New York put it in 1966:

> One of the all-encompassing realities is clear. Adherence to the advocacy of an expanding system of public higher education has now become one of the most popular positions in current political life... The tremendous surge in the numbers of college-age youth coupled with the ever-growing needs for trained manpower and retrained manpower has made political leaders aware more than ever before of the close relationship between a strong economy and a highly educated citizenry... These developments combine to make a political platform in favor of expanded higher education most attractive to any candidate or any office incumbent.

A 'flood of letters' from constituents complaining that their children could not find a place in the state's academic institutions, or complaints of the lack of skilled personnel, would 'soon sharpen the sensitivity of the legislator'.[21] Legislators could not plan private higher education, but with public higher education they could plan, and directly or through the expanding professional bureaucracy could look for particular developments and outcomes.

Attempts were made in the 1960s to classify the types of state-wide machinery that evolved for higher education, and the typologies have continued to change as the states themselves have moved in different directions. The typologies have had to do with the voluntary or mandatory nature of machineries, the distribution of authority between a central state body and the governing boards of individual institutions, the concepts of co-ordination or control.[22] Before the Second World War states varied considerably in their degree of control over their major state colleges, but generally exercised close control over the teachers colleges. One discussion of the state and higher education in 1933 talked of a quarter-century old position of 'disunification' which was 'distinctively American' and 'a

dominant tone in our state higher education'. A movement towards statewide unification could be detected.[23] In many cases by the 1960s autonomous state boards had been created, taking higher education out from under multi-purpose education departments. Against initial resistance and finally acquiescence from the University of Illinois, an Illinois Board of Higher Education was created in 1961 — the creation of which was supported by, amongst others, the teachers colleges.[24] In many cases the institutions favoured independent boards as preferable to control from the state's general education machinery. As the position of higher education in public opinion and the 'sensitivity of legislators' grew more uncomfortable in the late 1960s, strengthened state-wide machineries began to look more attractive for self-defence reasons. A book on statewide planning in 1971 opened with the statement:

> Never before in the history of higher education has the concern over statewide planning been so widespread. With our institutions of higher education under attack, statewide planning is being regarded by many as the vehicle that can effect better institutional management and enhance public opinion of higher education.[25]

One of the authors of this passage was to indicate, thirteen years later, the other side of that argument, when he suggested in 1984 that the state colleges were 'not yet an endangered species, but that their vitality was in question, given that 'the drift of the last thirty years has been for public institutions to be treated increasingly as if they were state administrative agencies with all the concomitant constraints and limitations'.[26]

Across that period there had been no shortage of warnings about the dangers of state control. A distinguished Committee on Government and Higher Education warned in 1959 that

> all-embracing supervision is a recipe for institutional mediocrity in the field of higher education ... excessive surveillance causes a climate of administrative caution and academic inertia which can only result in a second-rate institution.

One of the incentives for discussing the issue at the time was seen as the emergence of 'the state college system', and the historical 'double standard' under which large state universities had enjoyed substantial independence, while the 'normal schools' had been kept under stricter control.[27] There were obviously, therefore, ambiguities in the state-wide processes taking shape, and the new state colleges of the 1960s were to contribute their own share of ambiguity. They now found themselves, for example, with new nomenclatures and formal status, finding themselves in competition for the developments and resources that would give them public recognition and the necessary academic base and range. They were

now in competition with the major state universities for the funds that would enable them, for example, to develop a research profile. David Riesman was underlining the fact in 1969 that there was 'enormous apparent diversity in American higher education, but little genuine pluralism of esteem'.[28] This was especially true of, and understood by, the state colleges with aspirations to diversify quickly beyond teacher education, attract their share of the undergraduate market, and in many cases build the graduate activities that would enable them to be seen as quality academic institutions. The big land-grant universities, however, were themselves in an expansionist phase, very often on multiple campuses across the state, and seeking to maintain a high profile in their own competition with the private universities. Much of this kind of development across the board attracted labels like 'institutional aggrandizement', and the major state universities were accused in 1964 of submitting to excessive pressures to increase their size and diversification, failing to be or become 'true universities', and instead facing the danger of being 'sprawling monsters of mediocrity mistakenly called "universities"'. They were said to be wrongly claiming the right to diversify away from their traditional missions, mainly in the 'mechanic arts' and agriculture.[29] Both the state colleges and the state universities were under pressure to expand and diversify, and were themselves aware of the imperatives to do so.

The ambiguities for the colleges also related to their historically local, or in some cases regional, positions. In establishing their curriculum they had to balance their aspirations for local and wider student constituencies. Their perceived roles continued to focus around regional needs, the teaching of those professional and liberal arts courses which responded to those needs, and the provision of access to 'all who can benefit'.[30] Fulfilling service functions, while at the same time developing liberal arts programmes, graduate studies and research, also pointed to the difficulties of role definition, particularly when in close proximity to other institutions and feeling the sharp edge of competition. More than one commentator in the late 1960s talked of an 'identity crisis'. Part of the problem was balancing their own commitments to both vocationalism — once the professional preparation of teachers, now widely expanded into training for other professions, business administration, and in some cases the technologies — and to a liberal education, notably the tradition of general education. In fact it was often that commitment to general education that was at the centre of institutional self-definition and the signals prepared for accreditation purposes. All of these state institutions, older land-grant or newly promoted, were by definition held to a policy of low fees,[31] which ultimately meant greater dependence on state appropriations. For the moment, however, in a situation of expansion and high public regard, for most of the 1960s the colleges were part of what Clark Kerr called the

376

'Golden Age' of American higher education, from 1945 to 1970.[32] Another commentator, in 1969, summarized the story:

> American higher education has moved in slightly more than a century from the 'era of the college,' through the 'era of the university,' and is now well into 'the era of the state educational system'.

This systematization, he continued, probably affected the state colleges and universities more than other types of institution because of their position between the community college and the multiversity, and their greater need for 'the differentiation and coordination of roles'.[33]

It is in this framework of growth, coordination, redefinition and real or potential problems regarding the erosion of academic autonomy, that the states and their systems in the 1960s need to be seen. The vocabulary of analysis has to be that of expectations of responsiveness and accountability, local and regional traditions and wider conceptions of the roles of colleges and universities, student access and economic need. The diagram of accountability — one of the priorities for our attention here — is a relatively complex one. It includes not only the state's involvement in programme approval and review, budgetary allocations and controls, and other forms of scrutiny, but also the state's role in the licencing of teachers, accreditation by one of the six regional associations concerned with institutional accreditation, and programme accreditation by the many specialized national agencies. The state colleges were in a number of interrelated struggles for identity and esteem, and the terms of the struggle were to be strongly governed by interests other than their own.

Features of these American developments have British echoes though, the post-1963 framework of public sector higher education was established in relation to the polytechnics, with teacher education becoming a central element only after the James Committee had reported in 1972. The binary policy elaborated in 1965 and 1966 formally established an alternative sector of higher education and closed off the 'unitary' option. When the Labour government issued its White Paper, *A Plan for Polytechnics and Other Colleges* in May 1966, it believed 'that the role of these leading colleges was and should remain essentially different from that of the universities', that they should offer a broad range of subjects, develop interdisciplinary studies, and courses below degree level and part-time.[34] The first list of designated polytechnics was issued in April 1967. The existence of the CNAA from September 1964 was described by the DES as 'a most important factor in the future development of the polytechnics',[35] and by the combination of the CNAA and the designation of polytechnics within the binary policy two crucial steps had been taken away from the NCTA and the CATs: it was no longer a question of

validating miscellaneous courses in institutions which would later transfer into the university fold: the CNAA and the polytechnics now formed a *sector*.

The motivation for this policy direction has attracted a considerable amount of comment and analysis, and there is no doubt that diverse, ambiguous and conflicting motives were involved. Robbins himself argued hotly in 1965 that it represented 'the idea that the universities must be kept pure', based on an outmoded and indefensible view of the universities, and an attempt to locate a 'vocational' mission in the new sector. 'The belief', he proclaimed, 'that, for the majority of university students, there is no vocational motive in the university years is just not in accordance with the facts'. There was no hard and fast line between 'the pure and the applied, the academic and the vocational; and the modern university, with its multiplicity of types of study and courses, is already deeply committed to both'.[36] Robbins was right that the binary policy was intended in part as a *defence* of a particular view of the traditional university, as Sir Toby Weaver, one of the principal architects of the policy, was later to admit. He spelled out this logic in some detail. The universities were 'tight groupings of subject specialists properly intent on the possession, expansion and transmission of the knowledge they guard'. The problem was how to protect this function 'compatibly with meeting the educational needs of the population'. The universities' commitment to scholarship and professional expertise would be damaged by admitting 'the vast majority of students who are not potential scholars or experts'. The higher education of the majority revolved, in his definition, around the concepts of 'capability', 'creativity' and 'communion', translated into wider aims, wider curriculum and wider access than the universities could 'compatibly' provide. The logic therefore pointed to the belief that

> the polytechnics and other public service institutions should leave to the universities the essential function of pursuing and transmitting specialist knowledge through research and scholarship and that, drawing on this knowledge should concentrate on the no less difficult and important task of meeting this wider demand from potential learners from 18 to 80.

Weaver acknowledged that the view and the policy for the universities could be considered 'conservative, even reactionary', but he described himself, in 1982, as 'unrepentant'.[37] Others beside Robbins joined in the judgment of the policy designed to protect the universities in this way as misguided[38].

Any defence of the universities in those terms is also an attack. Francis Cammaerts referred to the Robbins argument that the binary policy represented an alliance of 'the most conservative of university

purists' and the DES, anxious 'to retain control over vocational courses of all kinds and teacher training in particular'. He might have added, said Cammaerts, 'the extreme egalitarians, who regard the universities with such suspicion that they wish to keep them isolated from the major expansion of higher education which is bound to come'.[39] There were, as Cammaerts and others pointed out, other defences of the binary policy: its cheapness, its responsiveness to urgent public need, greater public control over the efficient use of the plant. Maclure described the binary policy as specifically opposed to 'academic drift' upwards: 'some institutions would be held to their mundane obligations'.[40] At the point of formulation in 1965 and 1966, it is likely that Crosland and Weaver did not have an overriding and clear motivation. Crosland's speeches announcing the policy are both committed and confusing, and neither in motivation nor in anticipated outcomes is there any great clarity. All of the suggested motives, plus a strong sense of the specific histories of the institutions concerned and of their 'mundane obligations' to specific categories of students and to the economy, are involved. The policy and the polytechnics were not, as Crosland himself underlined, a new idea:

> . . . the system already existed. I did not invent it; it had been developing steadily since the turn of the century or earlier. Alongside the universities we had the training colleges under local authority or denominational control; and we had a strong and growing sector of higher education in FE . . . This was the plural or binary system — whatever you choose to call it — which we inherited.

It could hardly be suggested, he argued, that such a whole 'higher education sector' (as Crosland projected the terminology back in time) could be handed over to a 'unitary system entirely under university control'.[41] Here again, there was ambiguity. That was a way of representing the strength of the sector. As was pointed out, however, it could be portrayed as the reverse, as a 'freezing' of curricular and other distinctions which belonged to the nineteenth century.[42]

The polytechnics were to be 'complementary' to the universities,[43] and as such from the late 1960s began, as some American counterparts, to balance their local and regional origins and responsibilities, with national roles. The polytechnics, notably the Committee of Directors of Polytechnics (CDP), accepted the notion that they were distinctive, but had considerable difficulty with the definition — except in their commitments, for example, to sandwich courses and part-time students. Were they, for example, to be distinctively teaching or teaching-and-research institutions? An appendix to Crosland's Parliamentary statement of April

1967 designating the first twenty-eight polytechnics, directly addressed the question of 'Research in polytechnics':

> The main responsibilities of the polytechnics will be as teaching institutions, but it will be necessary to make the provision for research which is essential to the proper fulfilment of their teaching functions and the maintenance and development of close links with industry.

The emphasis was entirely on research for industry, primarily local industry, and on research which would 'contribute to the better performance of their teaching duties'.[44] It was a reluctant and ambiguous statement, and it led to continuing DES insistence that 'the polytechnics are primarily teaching institutions. Their efforts will be concentrated not on the origination of new knowledge but on the development and application of what is known towards the fulfilment of the personal and professional concerns of their students and the solution of industrial and social problems'.[45] In a debate about research in the Council of the CNAA a DES representative argued, in September 1966, that the polytechnics were primarily teaching institutions, and were not intended to develop into a 'system of state universities'.[46] The CNAA anxiously sent a deputation to the Secretary of State, and when the statement on research was issued by the Secretary of State in May of the following year, the Council recorded both its disappointment that the statement was not more positive, and its relief that 'the statement was considerably more liberal than the original draft which had been amended since the Chairman of the Council had made representations about the matter to the Secretary of State'.[47]

This is but one illustration of the issues that were to emerge by the launching of a public sector. There was discussion by the beginning of the 1970s not only of such basic questions as the academic 'distinctiveness' of the polytechnics, but also of their future relationship with the local authorities and the CNAA, and of the interest (at least of some of the polytechnics) in a form of independence which would give them 'the right to award degrees and other qualifications', an independence which the CDP estimated they could all earn within a period of ten years from the point in 1972 when they made this statement to a House of Commons committee.[48] Questions of freedom and real parity were increasingly focal to discussion within the CNAA from the beginning of the 1970s. By 1968 the University Grants Committee was becoming anxious. It looked at the differences between what it called the 'autonomous' and the 'public' sectors (the latter of which was 'vertically comprehensive' by incorporating degree and non-degree work, which was one of the characteristics universities were not designed to have). The UGC saw a tendency already for

the polytechnics to increase their degree work at the expense of the other, and there was 'some danger ... of this tendency getting out of hand'. Although it was reasonable to develop some postgraduate work, they should embark on this 'only sparingly ... concentrating perhaps on instructional courses of an applied technological or vocationally biased nature ... and to restrict the extent of their research effort, particularly in general academic fields, leaving the bulk of postgraduate work and research to the universities...'.[49]

By the early 1970s, therefore, the polytechnics were engaged in a struggle for esteem, resources, greater independence, a clearer definition of their roles, opportunities to fulfil their mission to the higher education system. Questions of their nomenclature, and the name of the CNAA itself, were constantly raised, given the unshakeable prestige in the British system of the title of 'university', and the difficulties of 'parity' with a 'polytechnic' identity, and different (which in almost all respects meant worse) levels of resourcing. The difficulties of the sector were compounded when to it — without the same fanfare that accompanied the creation of the polytechnics — were added the colleges of education, which became colleges or institutes of higher education from the mid-1970s, struggling in increasingly adverse conditions to diversify, to fill interstices in the system, to assert their own traditions and opportunities, to retain in many cases their teacher-education core while attempting to demonstrate their change of identity. Their formal entrance into the sector, to be marked from the beginning of 1982 by their inclusion in the same funding machinery as the polytechnics, initially called the National Advisory Body for Local Authority Higher Education (NAB), was treated with suspicion and hostility by the CDP. Although the polytechnics and colleges now formed a single sector in terms of public policy, funding anomalies within the sector, and public images of the institutions, made it difficult to think of the sector as a coherent one. Between and within the sectors of higher education the new diagrams of accountability did not remove the basic sense of hierarchy, and as the financial cuts deepened in the 1980s the identity crises of institutions became increasingly acute.

In both the American and British systems there had been projected into the 1980s, therefore, a tension between the strengthening of controls and the search for greater institutional identity and autonomy. In the 1970s, in the US, 'increasingly sophisticated legislators, backed by professional staffs, became more directly involved in both the substance and procedures of state higher education policy'[50] and something similar could be said of the British experience in the 1980s. It is important to underline that the American states were developing machineries of implementation as well as strong policies. The West Virginia Board of Regents, for example, established in 1969 'to govern and coordinate higher education',

exercised general management of the state colleges and universities, allocated to them specific functions and responsibilities, set standards 'for the hiring, tenure and dismissal of teachers' at the institutions, and was to exercise seven types of function in the evolution of 'the role and the scope of each institution': allocation of operational and capital funds; approval of new academic programs; review of existing academic programs; approval of major administrative and organizational changes; approval of requests for funds from outside sources; appointment and retention of presidents; establishment of system-wide operational parameters for selected areas of activity.[31] As a result of such increased coordination and control there were inevitably protests at 'over-regulation' and calls for its removal.[32] A New Jersey commission report on *Autonomy and Accountability in Higher Education* underlined the intention to allow state colleges 'to operate with autonomy within the general policies and guidelines set by the Board of Higher Education', but concluded that the state colleges were highly accountable, 'but lack the autonomy in spite of statutory provisions that would balance their responsibilities with authority to act'.[33] By 1986 the national association of these institutions was launching a commission to study the role and future of the state colleges and universities, and the commission issued a summary of the issues it wanted to have discussed at a series of regional seminars. The first issue for discussion read:

> What distinctive role should state colleges and universities serve in US higher education, in light of their history and contribution . . . What should be the primary educational missions of state colleges and universities?[34]

Whatever their original roles and purposes, within these state-wide contexts and in the operation of the market, there was repeated discussion of their uncertain direction.[35] There were still battles for image and esteem, sectorial and public conflicts of many kinds.

What the British public sector was having to learn by the 1980s was a much more aggressive version of managing contraction. The context of the late 1970s and 1980s was one of the simultaneous and related economic decline and the search for 'a national system of management and control' which began with the Oakes Committee's report on the subject in 1978, moved through the power struggle for control in 1981 and the establishment of the NAB the following year, and through to the government's 1987 proposals for its replacement by a Polytechnics and Colleges Funding Council.[36] In the British situation the twin planning elements for the NAB were both finance and the allocation of student numbers. Paradoxically, while acting as an instrument for reducing expenditure, the NAB also helped to strengthen the sector in many ways, including in competition with the university sector.[37] The British colleges and polytechnics

operated by the 1980s in strong national frameworks of government and NAB policies, CNAA and university validation, regional and other national machineries, and if the protests against overregulation were more muted, and discussions of purpose less strident, it was because the priorities were more often the detailed business of survival.

Nevertheless, in both countries the public sectors shared some important characteristics. Within their respective accountability diagrams they were concerned with programme development, student access and exercising their responsibility to provide opportunities. They shared a dual, sometimes schizophrenic, commitment both to the guardianship of higher education values on the one hand, and service to public need on the other hand. At the junction of the two, the research function has been a prominent issue of debate, with strong emphasis from the institutions in both cases on the maldistribution of resources and the protection of established research hierarchies as prejudicial to the proper functions and public esteem of the state or public institutions.

There are similarities, therefore, in the ways in which, within and surrounding the sectors in both countries, the institutions have found themselves under mounting pressure and scrutiny, in terms not only of cost effectiveness but also of programme approval and review, rationalization, diversification... In different forms there has been similar concern over the preservation and even strengthening of hierarchies. The differences, of course, are important in any more detailed account of the operation of these processes — differences in secondary education and how these affect curricular and other concerns of the colleges and universities; differences between British further education and American two-year colleges and the relationships of both with other higher education; differences in student funding and fee levels; and above all, the operation of the market. All of these are also to be explained in terms of national histories of approaches to student access, quality control, responsiveness to social and economic needs, the distribution of responsibilities for management and control, for finance and curriculum, for policy direction.

Policy direction and the shaping and accumulation of implementation measures are the underlying interest in this analysis. The complexity of historical policy analysis is readily illustrated by the binary example. The questions there for the historian include: Was it a piece of modernization, a response to economic needs? Was it a feature of conflicts over control between government departments? Was it an attempt to defend the 'purity' of the university, or an attack on the isolation of the university? Was it a democratic response to the need for extended access to higher education? Was it the cheapest route to that end? Was it a once-and-for-all attempt to stop the upward drift of institutions, and to define further as well as higher education? Was it the result of an interpretation of the

'vocational'? It was, in fact, almost certainly to some extent all of those things. To respond to those specific questions, however, there is a need to reach historically into the basis of the Robbins approach to the universities and its proposals for teacher education; into the nature and effectiveness of the local authority and further education traditions; into the various kinds of aspiration promoted by the 1956 White Paper and the designation of the CATs; into the background to the 1950s and subsequent pressures to relate higher education and the economy; into the strains on the existing system, including London University's external degrees; into the purposes and impacts of the National Council for Technological Awards and the CNAA.

None of those and adjacent and related directions of attention directly answer questions as to whether such a policy was *right* or even *effective*, and still less whether greater government intervention in the forms it has taken has been *necessary* or *inevitable*. Given the rhetoric of market forces throughout all of this period in the United States, some of the paradoxes and ambiguities involved in the development of the state sector and its particular features have received very substantial public attention. Policy options are closer to the centre of American than of British public debate. Britain has in various ways paid the price of a more endemic policy contempt, of which attitudes in higher education have been a notable example. Where there are shared or very similar processes of the kind outlined here, there is a strong case for extended comparative or dual analysis, firmly grounded historically, as an antidote to official selectivity of data and the quick ministerial visit to gather the miscellaneous international bric-à-brac that passes for evidence and is said to 'inform' policy. This kind of analysis has become all the more pressing in the late 1980s as higher education — and education generally — has been driven towards market orientations and responsiveness and funding, and more ambiguous accountabilities. It is not only policy 'pluralism' that produces ambiguities. Strong central dirigiste policy-making can do the same.

Notes

1 Committee on Higher Education (1963) *Report*, London, HMSO, pp. 1 and 4.
2 Ministry of Education (1960) *Grants to Students*, London, HMSO, passim.
3 Association of University Teachers (1961) *Submissions to the Committee on Higher Education*, London, AUT, p. 8.
4 Government Statement on the Report of the Committee under the Chairmanship of Lord Robbins (1963) *Higher Education*, London, HMSO, pp. 3–4.
5 Public Law 88-204, 88th Congress, H.R. 6143, Sec. 2.

6 BARIKOR, C.N. (1986) 'Michigan's contribution to higher education: An historical view', *Education Today*, 36, 2, p. 37.
7 MCKEEN CATTELL, J. (1913) *University Control*, New York, Science Press, p. 252.
8 ALDEN DUNHAM, E. (Ed.) (1969) *Colleges of the Forgotten Americans: A Profile of State Colleges and Regional Universities*, New York, McGraw-Hill, p. 35.
9 KIRK, R. (President, State Normal School, Kirksville, MO) addressing the Normal Department of the NEA (1914) 'The twentieth-century Normal School', *Journal of Proceedings and Addresses*, Ann Arbor, MI, NEA, p. 524.
10 MCNEELY, J.H. (1939) *Higher Educational Institutions in the Scheme of State Government*, Washington D.C., Department of the Interior, p. 1.
11 HARPER, C.A. (1939) *A Century of Public Teacher Education: The Story of the State Teachers Colleges as They Evolved from the Normal Schools*, Washington D.C., Hugh Birch-Horace Mann Fund, p. 130.
12 (Lock Haven) Central State Normal School (1927) Report of the Principal to the Board of Trustees at their Meeting, 12 January.
13 ANDRUSS, H.A. (1968) 'After 40 Years in Pennsylvania state colleges', *APSCUF Journal (Association of Pennsylvania State College and University Faculties)*, 22, 2, p. 6.
14 Lock Haven State College, Minutes, Board of Trustees, 11 October 1961, President's Report.
15 Lock Haven State College, Minutes, Board of Trustees, 21 May 1983, President's Report.
16 GRIFFITH, C.R. (1954) 'Should the state university provide curricula for all who seek admission?', *North Central Association Quarterly*, 28, 3, p. 270.
17 COHEN, A.M. and BRAWER, F.B. (1982) *The American Community College*, San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass, p. 9; MEDSKER, L.L. and TILLERY, D. (1971) *Breaking the Access Barriers: A Profile of Two-Year Colleges*, New York, McGraw-Hill, p. 13.
18 National Council for Technological Awards (1956) *Declaration of Trust*, 22 November, Sect.1.
19 White Paper, *Technical Education* (1956) quoted in Department of Education and Science (1964) *Reports on Education: Progress of the CATs*, 10, p. 1.
20 ROBBINS, LORD, (1966) *The University in the Modern World*, London, Macmillan, p. 148.
21 GOULD, S.B. (1966) 'The university and state government: Fears and realities', in MINTER, W.J. (Ed.) *Campus and Capitol: Higher Education and the State*, Boulder, CO, Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, pp. 7–8.
22 See, for example, GLENNY, L.A. (1966) 'State systems and plans for higher education' in WILSON, L. (Ed.), *Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education*, Washington D.C., American Council on Education; BERDAHL, R.O. (1968) 'Issues in statewide planning and coordination of higher education: Trends and implications for state colleges and universities'. *Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Meeting of the Association of State Colleges and Universities*, Washington D.C., AASCU; BERDAHL, R.O. (1971) *Statewide Coordination of Higher Education*, Washington D.C., American Council on Education.
23 KELLY, F.J. and MCNEELY, J.H. (1933) *The State and Higher Education*,

Phases of their Relationship, New York, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, p. x.

24 STAHL, W.K. (1980) 'The Illinois Board of Higher Education: The history of a strong statewide coordinating agency', paper to the US History of Education Society, mimeo.

25 GLENNY, L.A. and WEATHERSBY, G.B. (Eds) (1971) *Statewide Planning for Postsecondary Education: Issues and Designs*, Boulder, CO, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, p. vi.

26 WEATHERSBY, G.B. (1984) 'Our fading state colleges: Have they lost their vitality and mission?', *Change*, 16, 1, p. 49.

27 Committee on Government and Higher Education (1959) *The Efficiency of Freedom*, Baltimore, MD, Johns Hopkins Press, pp. 17 and 19.

28 RIESMAN, D. (1969) 'Commentary' in ALDEN DUNHAM, E. (Ed.) *op cit*, p. 175.

29 HEIMBERGER, F. (1964) 'The state universities', *Daedalus*, 93, 4, pp. 1085–6 and 1090–1.

30 SMITH, J. (1965) *Challenge to change — The state colleges and universities in a time of expanding responsibility, a position paper prepared for the Committee on Policies and Purposes of the Association of State Colleges and Universities*, Washington D.C., ASCU, pp. 1–5.

31 See, for example, THACKREY, R.L. (1964) 'Cooperation in public higher education' in Association of State Colleges and Universities (Ed.) *State and National Interests in Higher Education*, Washington D.C., ASCU.

32 KERR, C. (1977) 'Ice age or new horizons' in Hiroshima University, Research Institute for Higher Education (Ed.) *Perspectives for the Future System of Higher Education*, Hiroshima University, pp. 29–30.

33 HARCLEROAD, F.F. *et al*. (1969) *The Developing State Colleges and Universities: Historical Background, Current Status, and Future Plans*, Iowa City, American College Testing Program, p. 99.

34 Department of Education and Science (1970) *Reports on Education: The Polytechnics*, 65, pp. 1–2.

35 *ibid*., p. 3.

36 LORD ROBBINS, (1966) *op cit*, p. 152.

37 WEAVER, T. (1982) 'Policy options for post-tertiary education', *Higher Education Review*, 14, 2, p. 17.

38 See, for example, FORD, B. (1966) 'Crisis in higher education: Has Crosland made a basic error of judgment?', *New Statesman*, 21 January; VAIZEY, J. (1966) Contribution to a symposium on 'Who killed Cock Robbins?', *Twentieth Century*, 174, p. 1029.

39 CAMMAERTS, F.C.A. (1966) 'The binary system in higher education', *Forum*, 8, 2, p. 42.

40 MACLURE, S. (1982) 'British higher education policy', *Political Quarterly*, 53, p. 268. See also LUKES, J.R. (1975) 'Government policy over higher education', *Higher Education (Aspects of Education*, 18); SCOTT, P. (1983) 'Has the binary policy failed?' in SHATTOCK, M. (Ed.) *The Structure and Governance of Higher Education*, Guildford, Society for Research into Higher Education, pp. 170–6 (reproduced in SCOTT, P. (1984) *The Crisis of the University* London, Croom Helm, Chapters 6–7).

41 CROSLAND, A. (1967) 'The structure and development of higher education', speech at Lancaster University, 20 January, in ROBINSON, E.E. (1968) *The New Polytechnics*, London, Cornmarket, p. 193.

42 EDWARDS, E.G. quoted in FORD, B. (1966) *op cit*, p. 8.

43 Secretary of State for Education and Science, Parliamentary Statement, 'Polytechnics', 5 April 1967, Appendix A, 'Government and academic organisation of polytechnics: Notes for guidance', mimeo p. 1.
44 *ibid.*, Appendix B, 'Research in polytechnics'.
45 DES (1970) *op cit*, p. 4.
46 Davis, M.C. (1979) 'The development of the CNAA 1964–74', PhD thesis, Loughborough University, pp. 20–1.
47 Council for National Academic Awards (1967) Extract from the Minutes of a Meeting of the Council held on 5 May (a discussion of the Secretary of State's statement on 'polytechnics').
48 Committee of Directors of Polytechnics (1972) 'Memorandum of evidence to the House of Commons expenditure committee' in House of Commons (Ed.) *Minutes of Evidence Taken before the Expenditure Committee*, 31 January, London, HMSO.
49 University Grants Committee (1968) *University Development 1962–1967*, London, HMSO, p. 82.
50 McGuinness, A.C. Jr. (1986) 'Status of state coordination and governance of higher education: 1985' in Education Commission of the States (Ed.) *State Postsecondary Education Structures*, Denver, CO, ECS.
51 West Virginia Board of Regents (1979) *Profile of Progress*, Harrisburg, VA, pp. 1–3; West Virginia Board of Regents, *Excerpt from West Virginia Code*, Article 26.
52 For example, Pruitt, G.A. (1986) (President, Thomas A. Edison State College), *State College Autonomy and Accountability*, Trenton, NJ, New Jersey State College Governing Boards Association.
53 (New Jersey) Commission on Educational Accountability (1981) *Autonomy and Accountability in Higher Education*, Trenton, NJ, NJCEA, p. 17.
54 American Association of State Colleges and Universities, National Commission on the Role and Future of State Colleges and Universities (1986) *Summary of Issues for Consideration at the Regional Seminars*, Washington D.C., AASCU, mimeo.
55 See, for example, Weathersby, G.B. (1984) *op cit*.
56 *Report of the Working Group on the Management of Higher Education in the Maintained Sector* (1978) London, HMSO; Passmore, B. (1981) 'The great takeover bid', *Times Educational Supplement*, 20 February, p. 11; Department of Education and Science (1987) *Higher Education: Meeting the Challenge*, London, HMSO.
57 Finch, J. and Rustin, M. (Eds) (1986) *A Degree of Choice? Higher Education and the Right to Learn*, Harmondsworth, Penguin, p. 13.

Chapter 5

From Great Expectations to Bleak Houses

Between the mid-1960s and the 1980s there was in Britain a considerable decline in the reputation of higher education, and particularly of the universities, a decline that was clearly reflected in political attitudes to the funding and control of the universities, and in the precise policies adopted by governments. The decline in reputation and the direction of policy were complex, and had complex causes. The most common focus for analyses of the 'crisis' in higher education has been the 1980s, but the focus may be superficial and misleading. 'Crisis in higher-education' is a headline not from the 1980s, but from *The New Statesman* in January 1966, for an article by Boris Ford on the 'binary' policy of the Labour Secretary of State for Education and Science, Anthony Crosland. 'Who killed cock Robbins' was the generic title for eight articles, not in the 1980s, but again, 1966 — *Twentieth Century*'s view of the position in higher education, three years after the Robbins report on higher education had been received with widespread enthusiasm. Perspective from quotations may be equally difficult — for example:

> The going in education is tough and for higher education tougher. Universities have become used to being upopular and keeping their heads down below the parapet so as not to get hit by the flak... It is virtually impossible to plan any longer.

Not a response to the major financial crisis following Conservative policy in 1981, but 1976 — Lord Annan, reflecting on the world inherited by Reg Prentice as Labour's new Secretary of State. Annan was responding to what he called the recent 'direct hit' suffered by the universities, with £21 million disappearing from the recurrent grant, £15 million from equipment grants, the building programme 'in ruins': 'gloom caused by the explosion hangs in the air'. The polytechnics 'say they are even worse hit, and we believe them'.[1] When gloom stays in the air it is difficult

to remember the timing: when it stays so long carbon dating may be necessary.

Given the centralized funding mechanisms of British higher education for most of the twentieth century, and given the existence of national governmental and quasi-governmental bodies concerned with various aspects of planning and control, it could be expected that there would be clearly identifiable processes for national higher education policy-making.[7] The Secretary of State for Education and Science, the Department of Education and Science, the University Grants Committee and the National Advisory Body for Public Sector Higher Education (both until they were superseded in 1988), and others, have indeed been concerned with policy, in different ways, for different lengths of time, in different contexts, and with different responsibilities. In spite of strong ministerial and Parliamentary authority, however, and the replacement of the NAB and the UGC by two new bodies, differently structured and with different remits from their predecessors and from each other — the Polytechnic and Colleges Funding Council (PCFC) and the Universities Funding Council (UFC) — there is no single, overarching locus of detailed policy formulation which lays down in general — and for many processes in particular — the operation, requirements and standards of higher education institutions. In matters of national funding, some aspects of manpower planning and curriculum balance, student numbers and support for fees and maintenance, government has been increasingly able to determine or seriously influence policy and practice, but this is not the case, for example, with regard to the components of quality control. However responsive universities may be to public debate and pressure, they are by virtue of their charters in many respects autonomous and responsible for their own practices. The Council for National Academic Awards has similar charter responsibilities for ensuring the standards of the colleges and polytechnics whose work it validated from the mid-1960s, and to many of which greater autonomy was devolved under a system of accreditation from 1987. In a relatively centralized system, therefore, matters to do with the institutions' internal process and with responsibility for their effectiveness are relatively fragmented, and are devolved to institutions or bodies with different degrees of power, different terms of reference and different powers in the university and non-university sectors.

Moves in the late 1980s towards greater central control still left central policy determination in many respects weaker than in some other European countries. The relative diffusion of policy-making processes at different levels of the system is explained to a large degree by the ways in which modern higher education institutions and sectors have taken shape. Some universities emerged under the sponsorship of London University, for example. Others were created, notably, in the 1960s, de novo. Some

have been promoted to be universities from other identities. Some — the polytechnics and colleges of higher education — were also promoted from other identities but to parallel the university system, not to join it. All have had long-established Oxbridge, Scottish and European models of internal structures, teaching practices and the evidences of scholarship available to them, and from the 1960s particularly American models of curricula and organization were also added. The emergence of the external examiner system in the early twentieth century offered a uniquely British guarantee of standards, though one which was not without its critics — including in government — in the 1980s. Basic aspects of the modern university, carried over in various ways into the emergent sectors of 'public sector' higher education in the 1960s and 1970s, contributed to underlying assumptions — at least within higher education itself — that there were understood and reliable standards, nationally and internationally recognized and applauded. Throughout higher education, but especially in the universities, whose internal processes were less visible than those in the explicitly validated sector, it became necessary from the early 1980s to respond publicly, if uncertainly, to criticism and challenge regarding their roles and responsiveness, to defend their practices, to explore the meanings and accountabilities involved, and to examine the implications for their operations of changes associated above all with economic constraint.

Policy issues in higher education have therefore to be pursued in a more complex set of frameworks than might at first appear necessary from the outside. It would be mistaken to trace the fortunes of higher education from the early 1960s to the late 1980s as a linear descent. It is important to have in mind the conflicts and confusions whenever the transect is taken. For example, when the Labour Party's study group on higher education, the Taylor Report on *The Years of Crisis*, appeared in March 1963, *The Guardian* considered it 'of central importance to the economic and social future of this country'. *The Times* looked at the report's proposal for forty-five new universities and ridiculed it — 'everything is to be doubled, or trebled, or quadrupled... It is doubtful if the cause of educational expansion, or for that matter the cause of the Labour Party, is really served by this sort of fairy-tale pamphleteering'.[2] The protection of the system against what *The Times* editorial labelled 'paper universities' was in tension with the need for expansion, one of the pressures for which was the growing anxiety about what *The Guardian* editorial called 'Britain's disappointing economic performance', itself linked to what it saw as an out-of-date educational system and class structure. Part of the history of the quarter-century from the Robbins period to the period of Sir Keith Joseph's 1985 Green Paper on higher education, which heralded the nadir of the political reputation of higher education, has to be written in terms

C290

of economic performance. Reflecting on British higher education in the 1960s and 1970s Lord Annan made the connection very close: 'The decline in the esteem of higher education is linked to the decline in the performance, in some cases the extinction, of British industry'.[3] There are, however, other links.

The Robbins Committee was established in February 1961. Pressures for an enquiry had been mounting, at the same time as university expansion was taking place under ground rules laid down by the University Grants Committee. In May 1957 Michael Stewart was telling the House of Commons of the need for such an enquiry into the way in which the universities were meeting the needs of the nation, and in May 1960 Lord Simon of Wythenshawe was telling the Lords of the need for such an enquiry, which would look ahead for the next twenty years.[4] In reporting these and similar pressures, *Nature* was drawing attention to the difficult but necessary relationship between the universities and technological change. A more explicit emphasis on such a redefined university function had become more central to debate in the late 1940s and 1950s — the need for what Lord Simon in 1949 described in terms of the production of 'far larger numbers of graduates for higher technical and managerial posts in industry', and Lord Hailsham in two different places in 1961 as the need to overcome university conservatism, to remove the 'extremely dangerous heresies that some studies are more gentlemanly than others', and to recognize the proper place in higher education of vocational studies linked with research.[5] A symposium in *The Times Review of Industry and Technology* a month before the Robbins Report was due to appear stressed overall the need for a combination of expanded access, a more general education, and an improved contribution to technological progress.[6] Expansion was in general discussed in those terms, and the Robbins Report itself summarized its purposes in a final flourish, looking for a revaluation of priorities that would ensure 'the maintenance of our material position in the world, but, much more, it is an essential condition for the realization in the modern age of the ideals of a free and democratic society'.[7] Increasingly, the two were being linked.

The mood was buoyant, but the Robbins 'revolution', as many people called it,[8] was not to be plain sailing. The economy was from the time of the report constantly to interrupt or delay planning and implementation. For the Association of University Teachers (AUT) the Report and its recommendations were already too late. For Robbins himself the government's half-hearted reception and timescale were disappointing: 'If the government means business it must not wait for the spring; it must take action now before we adjourn for Christmas... Unless something is done quickly, opinion in the universities will crystallize into thinking that the government does not mean business about the "bulge" but only indulges

in fine phrases and nebulous sentiment about expansion'. Lord Eccles supported Robbins' call for greater urgency.[9] The importance of the Report itself lay partly in the fact that it had happened at all,[10] partly in the imprimatur it placed on the need to think in terms of a system of higher education in response to urgent needs, and partly in its elevation of the discussion of higher education from the doldrums into which it had fallen since the late nineteenth century. Economic distress signals, already alarming higher education, were often being seen as temporary and surmountable without too much pain, once the proper remedy against economic lurches had been found. The clear relationship between higher education and the economy that was being made central to the political and public image of higher education was to have three outstanding implications for its future status and for perceptions of its roles and effectiveness in fulfilling them. The first had to do with delivery: if the state, acting as custodian of the combination of the nation's 'material position' and democratic values, was investing more and more clearly on behalf of the former, how accountable could higher education be held for what it contributed — or not — to the solution of urgent industrial, economic and technological problems? The second, not unrelated, had to do with images of higher education and its component parts, particularly 'the university': in the balance of 'innate conservatism' that Hailsham saw in them and the 'spirit of initiative and innovation' that he wanted of them[11] — where did the weight lie? Were they sufficiently 'wordly' to merit the confidence, and the investment, placed in them? The third had to do with the differential perceptions that the concept of 'higher education' involved, particularly as the estate was extended and divided by the binary interpretation that was to emerge some two years after Robbins reported: how would the polytechnics, and later the colleges of higher education, alter the landscape of expectation and esteem?

Expansion, the mounting education budget, perceptions of industrial and technological backwardness, the shaping of centralized policies — by all governments — to meet international competition and reinvigorate economic performance, all combined to make higher education — and in the 1960s specifically the universities — more likely to be faced with direct and specific calls for greater public accountability. Some critics of expansion were concerned about increased dependence on government, and the Robbins proposals for a single Grants Commission and a separate Ministry of Arts and Science to oversee it were a source of further public debate about university autonomy and accountability.[12] It is important also to remember that within the general acceptance of the need for, or inevitability of, continuing expansion there were anxieties about government priorities, staff shortages, the continuation of old rigidities and threats to basic university values.[13] Evidence of weakness was an invita-

tion to stronger central planning. The need to influence the direction of the curriculum and student choice had already, in the late 1950s, exercised the Anderson Committee, whose report on *Grants to Students* in 1960 warned against central attempts to 'distort the system of awards so as to favour one branch of learning above another'.[14] By 1969 A.H. Halsey was describing the UGC as being in 'turmoil and doubt': the UGC had been transferred from the Treasury to the DES, a Public Accounts Committee's report of 1967 had led to the opening of the UGC's and the universities' books and records for the inspection of the Comptroller and Auditor General, and a Prices and Incomes Board report in December 1968 on academic salaries 'heralds the possibility of direct intrusion into university affairs by an instrument of government which is outside the control of the UGC or the DES'.[15]

Government involvement did not necessarily mean — as the experience of the United States in the 1960s and 1970s demonstrated — government control. The direction of the British economy, however, did result in government and public discussion of higher education being increasingly in the vocabulary of economic performance. Sociologists were pointing internationally to the increasing integration of higher education into the financial planning machineries of states, and their increasingly direct function in the rapid growth of technology and all that related to and depended on it. British failure to maintain a lead position in advanced technology therefore became part of the critique of higher education and of its performance in delivering the means of progress.[16] From the second half of the 1960s the discussion of the universities' relationships with industry accelerated. The universities were being placed on the defensive, subjected to specific manpower demands, drawn more centrally into the accountability diagram.

In relation to their ability to deliver, the universities' (and to a lesser degree other institutions') public images were now becoming vitally important. In any explanation of their reputation with government or public their images of 'unworldliness', isolation, lack of care for those values seen by significant publics as priorities, student life style and behaviour, indifferences to the material needs of the society ... have to be borne in mind. The presence of such images in the public consciousness was not new either to the twentieth century or to universities internationally. The ability of, or the need for, universities to adapt to changing conditions, to become part of a progress of 'modernization', is a debate as old as the universities themselves. From the 1950s, however, the processes were accelerating to the point at which the responsiveness of the universities was a matter of sharp and permanent scrutiny and comment. 'It is not right,' commented *Nature* in 1957, 'to suggest that the universities of Great Britain are indifferent to the problems of fitting students for life in

the modern world' — the defence indicating the strength of the attack. 'The monastic seclusion and unworldliness of the university ivory tower is a myth', wrote a chemistry lecturer from Aston in 1970 — the defence indicating the strength of the myth.[17] The binary system was seen by many as a recognition, and indeed a defence, of the university's conservatism, isolationism and elitism.

What was certainly the case by the late 1960s was a sense of crisis, partly related to the centralist issues highlighted by Halsey, partly related to mounting student radicalism and action, partly reflecting economic anxieties, partly to do with what Edwards calls 'a social and cultural failure'.[18] The failure was international — as C.P. Snow powerfully underlined in his 1959 lecture on *The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution* — but there was an uneasy feeling that it was worse and more damaging in Britain than elsewhere. One of the most vivid images of the British crisis of confidence, the British material and cultural decline, was the concept of the 'brain drain', the subject of widespread comment in the late 1960s, and the subject of a report by the Committee on Manpower Resources for Science and Technology in 1967. Within the loss of highly trained people to the United States and the Commonwealth lay a further critique of the universities, as Sir Gordon Sutherland pointed out in 1967:

> . . . the universities are not blameless in the shortage of scientific staff in industry. They tend to orient all their best men towards academic research and imbue them with the idea that the highest form of achievement is academic.

With few opportunities to pursue academic science in Britain, the young PhD went off to the United States, where large firms were 'skilful at diverting his interest in a few years into their own technological problems'.[19] Within the vicious circle the universities could not escape blame. They were failing to provide, to influence, to point in the necessary direction. Sutherland's solution, interestingly, was to devise international measures to control the flow of scientists, 'to protect the poorer from the richer nations'.[20] As the empire, manufacturing capability and other past glories receded, Britain had become a poorer nation needing protection, and the universities were increasingly part of the crisis of confidence now engendered.

The development of student militancy compounded the problem, developing further a public image of the student not only as radical, but also as unaccountable, as free to betray the society which provided and supported. Students themselves, of course, shared the crisis of confidence, as graduate unemployment began to feature in public discussion at the turn of the 1970s, as international relations, government policy, economic performance, called public authority and institutional authority into

94

question. Although the new student militancy made its first British appearance at the London School of Economics in 1967, it was already becoming a widespread international phenomenon and popular images of student behaviour derived from international as well as domestic sources. It was also associated in many people's minds with the very process of expansion which, in Britain as elsewhere, had significantly altered the composition of the student constituency. The Director of the LSE, reflecting in 1969 on the experience, concluded:

> The speed of growth in our numbers, size and membership and our developing differentiation and variety mean that universities can no longer depend on those who join us accepting or undertaking the unstated assumptions and conventions which have previously sufficed. We are now driven to be explicit, and we cannot expect the public, the local authorities, the central government or potential students to understand what universities stand for if we cannot define this for ourselves.[21]

The essential message here is a crucial one: under yet another pressure the universities were being driven to explain, to justify, themselves. Part of the explanation was in terms of government policy as well as in terms of student behaviour and institutional response: university independence had been threatened in 1967 by one of the government policies which had fuelled student radicalism — the government decision to raise university fees for overseas students. The universities and other institutions of higher education were facing in many directions simultaneously, having to be explicit about the institution in the midst of internal dissension and turmoil, and to defend themselves against the outside whilst under attack from within. Opposition to increasing fees for overseas students was having to be expressed at precisely the same moment as the universities' books were being opened to government audit — an extension of public accountability which, in the words of a Select Committee study of *Student Relations* in 1969 'aroused some disquiet and indeed anger among academics. Once again, the academic community, sensing itself threatened, took pains to assert its unique character', this in turn having its effect on student protest.[22]

This was a no-win situation, in which the rapidity of growth and change dictated some of the difficulties (though Sir Frederick Dainton and 'many non-British observers' considered that Britain 'had faced the challenge of growth with ingenuity and resourcefulness').[23] The universities were bound to cause offence and resentment somewhere, whatever action they might take. Student anti-materialism, appearance, behaviour, merely strengthened the view of the universities as esoteric places implacably distanced from the real world. Students as irresponsible adolescents,

universities as hothouses of dissent and the toleration of lax behaviour — the equation underlay much of the public discussion and the headlines around 'Unrest among students', a student riot in Cambridge in 1970, sit-ins and demands for student power. 'The student revolts of 1968–70', writes Edwards, 'were an excuse for a general reappraisal of the role and scope of higher education throughout Europe and to some extent internationally'.[24] They were, of course, only part of the 'excuse' and the 'reappraisal'. They were part of the complex of images which contributed to the pressure for increased state scrutiny to ensure that the universities matched up to the expectations of the economy and the society.

The third contributory element in the growing relationship between higher education and government policy-making was the binary interpretation placed on the emergent 'system' of higher education from 1965. Whatever the motives for the invention of the binary policy (though Crosland was to insist that it was merely a crystallization of existing structures) it brought government more directly into the manipulation of one segment of the new 'system' of higher education. John Vaizey thought it was not a policy at all, but 'a piece of rhetoric designed to make the university/non-university split sound acceptable to socialists'[25] — which, after all, is only another way of describing a policy. A different view from the left was that it was a *necessary* policy in order to respond to pressures for growth while at the same time preserving university autonomy: 'the universities should be regarded as centres of mainly academic work'. The polytechnics as a buffer against excessive pressure on the universities was a view that enjoyed a certain popularity.[26] Robbins thought the policy 'reactionary and half-baked' and his Committee had preferred to 'think of higher education as a spectrum'.[27] The Select Committee report on student relations underlined that the binary policy had created a situation which in practice 'does not solely reflect the different functions of colleges and universities but also involves differences in social amenities and status'.[28] The DES *Plan for Polytechnics and Other Colleges* in 1966 presented the policy as one which created 'a strong and distinctive sector of higher education which is complementary to the universities and colleges of education', and in one of its *Reports on Education* described the polytechnics as 'capable of developing interdisciplinary studies' and seen primarily as teaching institutions.[29] Since these differences were difficult to sustain, in principle or in practice, a continuing uncertainty and conflict of interests between the sectors had been generated. There was little chance, even in the 1980s, that, in the words of *The Economist*, the universities would agree that the polytechnics were equal: when the UGC asked the universities if there was an essential difference between them and the polytechnics most answers came 'with a pinched sniff of hauteur: universities do research; polytechnics are meant to be vocational, but have

forsaken their role to play at jobs only traditional dons can do'.[30] That uneasy hierarchical relationship was complicated in the 1970s by the entry of the 'colleges of higher education' into the public sector of higher education, and a similar suspicion on the part of the polytechnics that the upstart institutions would hamper the polytechnic drive for equal funding and equal esteem — what Peter Scott calls university disdain for the polytechnics, and 'double disdain' for the colleges.[31]

The estate was therefore well and truly divided. Additionally, however, there was to be continuing discussion about the funding and control of the public sector, begun under a Labour administration and finalized with the creation of the National Advisory Body in 1981 — against a background of local authority fears of government Big Brother taking over: 'Where will it stop, they wonder?'.[32] It would be misleading to present the NAB itself as a feature of the decline in esteem of higher education, but it is important to see it as an integral feature of the process begun in the 1960s: a system had been created which could not speak with a single voice, which was under increasing pressure to make its purposes and processes more 'explicit', and which from the outset fostered a sense of ambiguity and confusion. There had been little enough public debate about the desirable shape of the new universities in the early 1960s, some concern that Robbins expansion was to be more of the same, more assumption than discussion about the futures of the colleges of advanced technology elevated to 'university status' after the Robbins Report, little enough clarity in what was proposed in the late 1960s for the polytechnics, and nothing remotely resembling a public policy for the colleges of higher education created amidst talk of expansion and the realities of contraction in the 1970s.[33]

One of the most difficult moments for the historian to assess in the whole post-Robbins period will be Margaret Thatcher's 1972 White Paper *Education: A Framework for Expansion*. In the history of teacher education following the James Committee's recommendations a year earlier it has one set of meanings, but in terms of higher education generally it appeared at the time to have less threatening or ambiguous ones. A *Universities Quarterly* editorial board discussion of the White Paper, published under the title 'End of an era' was to prove to be prophetic.[34] The White Paper seemed to point towards a continuation of the Robbins principle, followed by successive governments since 1963 'despite the pressures of economic stringency and competing claims'. Whatever cautions were now expressed about the need for the purposes and nature of higher education to be 'critically and realistically examined' within the limits of resources and competing priorities, the essential message was optimistic:

> Opportunities for higher education are not however to be determined primarily by reference to broad estimates of the country's future need for highly qualified people... The government consider higher education valuable for its contribution to the personal development of those who pursue it; at the same time they value its continued expansion as an investment in the nation's human talent in a time of rapid social change and technological development.

Expansion of provision was still on the agenda (despite what was already known about future demographic trends), as was increased funding and even the possibility of establishing 'one or more universities' some time in the 1980s.[35]

In terms of higher education the reception was cordial. Boris Ford, as editor of *Universities Quarterly*, was unenthusiastic about the White Paper, given his anxieties about the direction of teacher education (though he welcomed its dropping of 'some of the more surrealist proposals of the James Committee') and his opposition to the binary policy, but had to introduce the editorial board discussion in December at what he called 'the moment of first and fairly flattering responses to the White Paper'.[36] Relief at the government's rejection of some of the James Committee's most controversial proposals was, indeed, accompanied by a sense of planned possibility which was soon to become emblematic of a lost process — the 'end of an era'. Reaction to the Conservative White Paper, as David Hencke indicates, was 'suprisingly muted, unlike the reaction to James, and almost complimentary, certainly in the press coverage of the time'.[37] The White Paper was therefore a source of optimism amidst an increasing noise of signals of gloom. Historians will read into it messages of ambiguity in contexts through which it appeared to light a path. They will interpret its glances back to the policies and possibilities of the 1960s, and its reflection of the difficulties of the 1970s and 1980s. The era which it ended may be seen to be one in which the excitements of optimism were still possible.

On the basis of these structures, images and ambiguities established in the 1960s, it is possible to see the weakness of higher education policy in the 1970s and 1980s — policy of the institutions as well as national agencies and government. It is arguable, as Crick has argued, that the universities revealed in the 1960s to 1980s that 'in neither expansion nor contraction do they have a real policy', or as Maclure has argued, that government policy has been rooted in persistent social values in the twentieth century and is 'obscure, ambiguous and incomplete; over large areas, the policy is to have no policy short of giving autonomous institu-

398

tions as much or as little money as the government thinks it can afford... Policy discussions have quickly switched away from disquieting issues of principle and purpose to more reassuring wrangling over student numbers and staffing ratios'.[38] That, for all parties, but specifically in the period of Sir Keith Joseph's tenure of office in the 1980s, became to some extent less true than when it was written in 1982. It is certainly true that policy-making for higher education in the 1960s and 1970s is best represented by discussions of student numbers and student grants, fees for home and overseas students, the extent and implications of cuts in the higher education budget, the capping of the advanced further education pool. Early in the life of the new Conservative government in 1979 Auriol Stevens wrote in *The Observer*:

> Last week's furore over government plans to cut the number of students entering universities next year was misplaced but instructive. There are not such plans. Indeed, the Government has as yet no discernible policy on higher education.[39]

Certainly up to that point, policy meant what government thought it could afford. The reputation of institutions and sectors was being conditioned by their additional image of the holder of the begging bowl.

By the 1970s the esteem — or perhaps more accurately the promise and the expectation — of higher education was being whittled away for various constituencies. Unlike the position in the United States, where qualifications and education become more attractive in conditions of economic difficulty, British students were increasingly ambivalent about qualifications which were declining in market value as graduate unemployment increased. The social sciences and humanities were being devalued as jobs proved harder to get, and with the deep-rooted British suspicion of engineering and technology students were not being attracted in those directions. The Labour Party drastically reduced teacher education targets after 1974. Tory MP Keith Hampson, chiding the Labour government and Shirley Williams for mishandling the transformation of the colleges of education, commented in 1977:

> ... the colleges should be providing courses which have some vocational relevance, but may have little to do with traditional degree courses... The people that the country lacks most are technicians, not degree people, and especially not people with degrees in humanities.[40]

The Conservative Political Centre, early in 1979, putting together a summary of reports received from discussion groups on further and higher education, complained of the duplication of functions between universities

and polytechnics, with the latter becoming second-class universities offering second-class degrees. There were too many students of 'trendy' subjects such as the humanities and social studies, with no job prospects. Polytechnics should 'provide for the less academically gifted'.[41] The Conservative Party may have entered government in 1979, as Auriol Stevens suggested, without any 'discernible policy on higher education', but it did have a reading of recent history on which to operate.

In general terms the Conservative Right had taken the initiative in the 1970s, with the *Black Papers*, Margaret Thatcher's assumption of the party leadership, and the 'new Right' philosophy piloted through party channels particularly by Sir Keith Joseph. The cuts in public spending that followed the election of the Thatcher government in 1979 were able to take higher education clearly into their sights not only in order to take their share of the medicine, but also in order to press further the process of central direction of the system and its parts. In 1979 and 1980 there were cuts in funding for the schools and for public sector higher education, a White Paper on public expenditure which forecast stringent times ahead, and 1981 was to be summarized by the *Times Higher Education Supplement* in its review of the year as '1981: Year of the cut'.[42] From 1979 the press had regular bold headlines forecasting and announcing cuts. The phraseology was of the 'cold wind blowing', budgets facing the axe, and the constant arithmetic of cuts — 9 per cent, 16 per cent... Student places also — '20,000 fewer places for students by 1985' announced *The Times* in July 1981. 'Hopes of varsity places "worst for 25 years"' proclaimed a *Guardian* headline in 1984. The headline industry was full of lecturers, polys, universities, colleges, places, students — all being cut. 'Since 1981', Peter Brooke, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Higher Education, told a conference on higher education two years later, 'the government's policy towards the funding of higher education has been one of restraint'. In the public sector, for example, reductions in funding would represent 'the first stage of a restructuring process' leading to greater concentration on 'the major and more cost effective institutions'.[43]

The logic on which the government operated was one of reduced public expenditure, coupled with stronger central planning and control of the system, applied differently and with different results in the two sectors. It was a logic which could count on a degree of 'public disillusionment with higher education itself', as Sir Frederick Dainton explained in 1981.[44] It could count on disarray within the estate and amongst the partners. It could build on the patterns of control and accountability beginning to take shape in the previous decades, and it could, in doing so, push in directions which would result in an altered balance of decision-making in the system.

Other factors entered into Conservative judgments of higher education. Eruptions of campus militancy tended to confirm the view that firmer controls needed to be set in place, that the 'professionalism' of staff was brought into question by their participation in action against the cuts — action which began to include strikes as well as other forms of protest. Student action, levelled against both cuts and government policies on a number of fronts — including South Africa — occasionally raised questions about free speech, as hard-line students resisted the appearance on campuses of ministers or hard-line Conservatives. Keith Joseph expressed the concern clearly, arising partly out of his own experiences — some of them 'fairly hair-raising' — since the mid-1970s. Where students were unable to exercise 'standards of judgment and scrupulous consideration of evidence', were intolerant and 'rejected wide ranges of experience', there were uneasy questions about students, about the ways in which universities safeguarded standards, and — when there were complaints — about the absence of any 'outside arbiter as a final appeal authority'.[45] In this and in other respects, the house of higher education was being held not to be in order.

For Keith Joseph the case of the Polytechnic of North London (PNL) assumed particular importance, since the range of action and problems connected with the polytechnic encompassed many of the concerns about students and staff, management and curriculum, political bias and public accountability. Several years of public notoriety centred around internal conflict, radical student action, accusation of Marxist bias and mismanagement, and a variety of causes célèbres. A CNAA investigation of bias and corruption in the teaching and examining of sociology resulted in a judgment supportive of the course and the polytechnic — a judgment which was contradicted by an HMI report on the same events. At the beginning of October 1983 newspaper headlines told the revised story: 'Degree that no one could possibly fail' (*Evening Standard*), 'College where nobody fails' (*The Daily Mirror*), 'A college where no one can fail' (*The Daily Mail*), '"Cheats" — Poly is accused' (*The Mail on Sunday*), 'Marxist-bias Poly courses condemned' (*The Daily Telegraph*). However much the evidence might be debated, whatever reservations might be expressed about exceptional cases, what confidence might be declared about the system generally, the public impact and what was made of it added to the impression of higher education adrift, of dark forces at work, of incompetence, of failure. No part of the system was immune, all were belaboured for the wrong directions they had chosen, the failures to deliver, the account to be rendered. Norman Tebbitt, as Secretary of State for Employment, castigated the new universities of the 1960s, for example, for having failed to develop on the technical front:

> Mediocre traditional academic results have been preferred to relevant technical qualifications... Indeed the second class academic has been preferred to the first class technician.[46]

The esteem in which the component parts of the system and higher education as a whole were held was now being conditioned not just by broad-sweep economic and political judgments, but by very precise images of the system's operations, attainments and outcomes.

All of those elements were present in the policies, or more precisely the crusade, that Sir Keith Joseph developed up to the crescendo of 1985. Joseph placed the economy at the centre of his policy concerns, and pursued questions of standards, management and accountability high on his list of priorities for both schools and higher education. Questions of financial 'restraint', of standards and of 'vocational' or economic relevance were the pillars of the increasingly strident policies or pronouncements. All reflected aspects of the reputation higher education had been acquiring under the pressures of the late 1960s and 1970s, and with strong governmental demands for rapid changes of industrial gear the focus was in these and other respects on the inadequacies of the system, of the institutions, and of its personnel. In January 1985, four months before the appearance of the Green Paper on *The Development of Higher Education into the 1990s*, Sir Keith Joseph summarized his views of the performance of higher education to the North of England Education Conference. In the speech he cast doubt on any necessary expectation that higher education teachers should be engaged in research, advocated a pay system 'less rigid' than existing national scales and the ending of tenure for new contracts, pointed to the need for more training and to 'extract the maximum value from every pound' (without implying any additional pounds for the staff training and development recommended), and argued for a system of staff appraisal in order to eliminate 'inadequate' teaching where it occurred ('I do not think there can really be any doubt that this is sometimes the case').[47] It was a carefully worded and structured statement, arising from a strengthening critique and a growing conviction that there were guidelines of performance that he and central machineries could bring into operation. These performance considerations, whatever their strengths and weaknesses, came closer to being a 'policy' for higher education than anything since the expansionist and binary aspirations of the 1960s. The latter, however, had been built on an acceptance, often insufficiently critical, of the strengths that could be developed. Joseph's strategies were built on a conception of the system's fundamental weaknesses.

The Green Paper brought those weaknesses and their implications squarely into the economic arena where higher education had been unable

102

clearly to locate its proper initiatives and responses as the cuts and squeezes had intensified in the 1970s and 1980s. The dominant language of the Green Paper was that of the economy, business, industry, vocational requirements ... together with the considerations of competence, standards, management and effectiveness previously gathering momentum. However else the document may be judged, it has to be seen as a lecture to the system about its inherent and unacceptable weaknesses, whether these be to do with its '"anti-business" snobbery', the inflexibility of its commitment to tenure or 'no compulsory redundancy' agreements, or its lack of adequate machinery for evaluating the 'quality, competence and attitudes of the academic staff'. The Green Paper sought to steer the system in a number of directions simultaneously, all of them away from perceived failures and weaknesses.[48] Discussing the policy later in the year, Sir Keith injected a touch of history: there had been enough complaints about standards 'to cause, to justify, a certain amount of concern that the admirable intentions of the universities need careful monitoring by the universities themselves'. Autonomous institutions needed to keep their guard up — 'particularly where in over twenty years there has been such a rapid expansion in some departments'.[49] The gentle phrasing of these and similar cautionary comments does not conceal the muscularity of the underlying critique.

There followed in 1987 a White Paper, *Higher Education: Meeting the Challenge*, under the auspices of Sir Keith Joseph's successor, Kenneth Baker, appointed as a better policy communicator — not in any sense as being ideologically different. The government was at a point where it felt more need to win friends and influence people over education than Sir Keith Joseph had been able to do. The new White Paper took the same strong interventionist direction, but slightly softened the tone: the government believed that 'the British system of higher education is among the best in the world'. Meeting the needs of the economy was 'not the sole purpose of higher education', but it needed to achieve 'greater industrial and commercial relevance', and new funding strategies would 'encourage and reward approaches by the universities which bring them closer to the world of business'. Polytechnics and colleges would develop 'greater responsiveness to economic needs', and be transferred out of control by the local authorities. To increase university financial accountability and effectiveness, the new Universities Funding Council would contain a stronger 'element of people from outside the academic world' and planning guidelines for the university system would be provided'.[50] The Act which followed, after consultation which had little impact on government intentions and proposals until debate reached the House of Lords in the early summer of 1988 — and even then with very little effect — continued to stipulate greater responsiveness on the part

of higher education sectors subject to new planning and controlling machineries. The point is not whether the new directions were right or appropriate or likely to be effective, but what they continued to reflect in terms of the esteem of higher education. The aim was greater 'effectiveness' for higher education, 'quality and efficiency', 'further gains in value for money'.[51] Underlying the structural, financial change of the White Paper and the Act was a severe critique of the past management, accountability and economic impact of the system, and specifically its ability to contribute to an economy and a society defined sharply on the basis of enterprise and competition.

The rhetoric of Britain's higher education being 'among the best of the world' does not disguise a continuing attack on some of the fundamentals of, in particular, the university system, and a powerful new dirigisme aimed at linking them more directly to the economy. We have traced some of the pressures on higher education that contributed to its overall decline in public esteem from the 1960s but it is important to emphasize also the nature of the system's responses to those pressures. The polytechnics were created at the end of the 1960s with the mission of responding more directly to social and economic needs than the universities could, would or were perceived as likely to do. The polytechnics combined in many ways the basic traditions of established higher education and a stronger commitment to a 'further education' or 'public sector' tradition of preparing for employment.[52] The universities, while being directly employment-related in specific subject areas, were more defensive of their autonomous tradition, and less amenable to explicit collaboration with and response to the world of employment and public service. Relationships between the universities and industry became, in Britain, a strong focus of discussion in the 1980s, particularly as government funding policies drove the universities rapidly towards market orientations for research support and finance in general. How much the universities were to be blamed for their earlier more muted approach to economic change and the protection of their autonomous position amidst deteriorating national budgets is a question which has important implications for the picture of a system with declining public and political esteem. If national policies are driven to a large extent by political ideologies, and if ideologies are rooted in contemporary pressures and pragmatic needs, then attitudes and policies towards higher education across this period also have to take account of the perceived or real weaknesses of the system, the sectors and the institutions themselves.

The complex journey from the 1960s has not been from golden age to dark ages, though it has often seemed to be so to the travellers. It has certainly been from great expectations to the bleak houses that resulted especially in the early 1980s from crises of confidence and an increasing

unwillingness to see higher education as the priority and essential investment which they were in other key advanced industrial countries. Even in the early 1960s there were policy and practical resistances to securing higher education expansion. In 1961 even the Conservative teachers were telling the Robbins Committee that what the Conservative government was giving and promising was not enough.[33] The clamour for expansion was already being accompanied in the mid-1960s by flurries of financial 'restraint'. The polytechnics were designated amidst financial adversity and were ill-funded for the roles defined for them. The story is therefore about economics, but is also about conviction, hostility, indifference, ambivalence and self-protection. The system itself has not had, or been allowed to have, the clarity of purpose on which public esteem depends — and esteem relates as much to that clarity and the visible pursuit of goals as it does to outcomes in terms of narrowly-defined success and failure.

Whatever loss of esteem can be attributed to the declining performance of British industry and consequent expectations of higher education, the supplementary explanations have to be given emphasis also. Policy is not simply what governments intend to do, it is a complex response to complex relationships. The houses became bleak, but they were also divided. Policy-making within the system itself was difficult and uncertain. At national levels planning and judgment were subordinated to the short-term implications of economic panic. Rhetoric was substituted for analysis. As the system came under attack, self-protective institutional and sectorial hierarchies were strengthened. To recover from those positions and to restore self-esteem and public esteem is not just a question of public relations or a sentence in official documents, it is a question of long-term relationships and policy, of clarified purposes in the contexts of the late twentieth century, of self-perception by the system as well as commitment by policy-makers. What the 1988 Act appeared to offer was an ambiguous future, one in which government was intending a firmer hand on overall policy, but one in which institutions in both sectors might have some greater flexibilities — over courses and their ability to compete in the market place. If expectations were being generated, these were not great in the sense that they had been in the 1960s, in totally different economic and political circumstances.

Notes

1 Lord Annan (1974) 'University challenge', *The Guardian*, 25 March, p. 14.
2 Labour Party (1963) *The Years of Crisis*, London, Labour Party; *The Times*, 6 March 1963; *The Guardian*, 6 March 1963.
3 Lord Annan (1982) 'British higher education, 1960–80: A personal retrospect', *Minerva*, 20, 1–2, p. 17.

4 *Nature*, 180, 4596, 1957, and 187, 4739, 1960. See also Moodie, G.C. (1959) *The Universities: A Royal Commission?*, London, Fabian Society.

5 Lord Simon of Wythenshawe (1949) 'University crisis? A consumer's view', *Universities Quarterly*, 4, 1, p. 78; Lord Hailsham (1961a) 'New and larger universities?', *Universities Quarterly*, 15, 2, p. 125; Lord Hailsham, (1961b) 'Functions of universities', *The Engineer*, 3 November, p. 735. (Lord Hailsham was at the time Minister for Science.)

6 *Times Review of Industry and Technology*, 1, 8, 1963, pp. 73–6 (contributors included the Chairman of the English Electric Co., the General Secretary of the TUC, the Chief Education Officer of ICI and others from industry, local government, and education).

7 Committee on Higher Education (1963) *Higher Education: Report*, London, HMSO, p. 267.

8 For example, by Lord Silkin in a House of Lords debate on the Robbins Report, reported in *The Guardian*, 13 December 1963. Sir Robert Aitken began an article on 'The Vice-Chancellors' Committee and the UGC' with the words: 'Robbins, like the flood, is a watershed in history', *Universities Quarterly*, 23, 2, 1969, p. 165.

9 Association of University Teachers, press statement following a special meeting of the Executive Committee, 8 November 1963, mimeo ('. . . it is now too late to do much that could have been done but for the ill-judged government cuts in university grants which we protested last year'); Lord Robbins, reported in *The Guardian*, 12 December 1963; Lord Eccles, reported in *The Guardian*, 13 December 1963.

10 Stuart Maclure considered it 'generally agreed that the most important thing about the Robbins Report was that it appeared at all', *Twentieth Century*, 174, 1029, 1966, 40.

11 Lord Hailsham (1961b) *op cit*, p. 735.

12 The AUT believed that 'without the Grants Commission and the separate Ministry we do not think the universities could survive in their characteristic role as independent bodies concerned with both research and teaching', press statement, mimeo.

13 The AUT emphasized that the expansion of higher education should not be at the expense of the Newsom report proposals for schools. Staffing difficulties were widely signalled, including by Collison, P. (1964) 'Scramble for dons: Appointments at new universities', *Times Educational Supplement*, 6 November. A.H. Halsey told the Select Committee on Education and Science in 1969 that the Robbins Committee had been too preoccupied with 'statistical prediction' and too little with the shape and quality of higher education, Select Committee on Education and Science (1969) *Student Relations, 1: Report*, London, HMSO, p. 29. Concern for 'values' came not only from the conservative reaction; it was vigorously expressed by Colin Crouch and Stephen Mennell (1972) in a Fabian Society pamphlet which cautioned against 'social investment' and industrial-need views of higher education, currently posing a threat 'to the values we seek to defend', *The Universities: Pressures and Prospects*, London, Fabian Society, pp. 1–5.

14 Committee appointed by the Minister of Education and the Secretary of State for Scotland (1960) *Grants to Students*, London, HMSO, p. 3.

15 Halsey, A.H. (1969) 'The universities and the state', *Universities Quarterly*, 23.

16 See EDWARDS, E.G. (1982) *Higher Education for Everyone*, Nottingham, Spokesman, chapters 6 and 7.
17 *Nature*, 180, 4596, 1957, p. 1152; ONGLEY, P.A. (1970) 'University development in the 1970's', *Universities Quarterly*, 25, 1, p. 83.
18 EDWARDS, E.G. (1982) *op cit*, p. 134.
19 SUTHERLAND, G. (1967) 'The brain drain', *Political Quarterly*, 38, p. 60. See also BLUME, S. (1968) 'Brain drain — a look at the literature', *Universities Quarterly*, 22, 3, and Committee on Manpower Resources for Science and Technology (1967) *The Brain Drain*, London, HMSO.
20 SUTHERLAND, G. (1967) *op cit*, pp. 60–1.
21 ADAMS, W. (1969) 'L.S.E. and the new militancy', *The British Universities Annual 1969* (AUT), p. 111.
22 Select Commitee (1969) *op cit*, p. 21.
23 DAINTON, SIR FREDERICK (1981) *British Universities: Purposes, Problems and Pressures*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, p. 8.
24 EDWARDS, E.G. (1982) *op cit*, p. 97.
25 VAIZEY, J. (1970) 'The future of higher education', *New Society*, 21 May, p. 867.
26 CROUCH, C. and MENNELL, S. (1972) *op cit*, p. 47. Lord James similarly thought that raising the status of other institutions 'and providing new kinds of higher education' would 'actually safeguard the standards of the universities themselves' by diminishing pressure from those desiring higher education but unable to benefit from 'the rigours of our present university courses', *The Observer*, 15 September 1963.
27 Interview with Peter Scott, '14 years later the Robbins faith remains unshaken', *Times Higher Education Supplement*, 4 November 1977.
28 Select Committee (1979) *op cit*, p. 43.
29 Department of Education and Science (1966) *A Plan for Polytechnics and other Colleges*, London, HMSO, p. 9; Department of Education and Science, (1970) *Reports on Education, no. 65: The Polytechnics*, London, HMSO, pp. 1–2.
30 *The Economist*, 21 April 1984, p. 26.
31 SCOTT, P. (1984) *The Crisis of the University*, London, Croom Helm, p. 14.
32 PASSMORE, B. (1981) 'The great takeover bid', *Times Educational Supplement*, 20 February.
33 Peter Wilby reflected in 1976 on the new universities of the 1960s that they 'were not even constrained by any public debate on what universities should set out to achieve ... without a single Parliamentary debate on the matter', having been conceived two years before the Robbins report, 'Interesting experiments but no radical change', *Times Higher Education Supplement*, 18 June 1976.
34 *Universities Quarterly*, 27, 2, 1973, a round table discussion by six members of the Board, introduced by Bosish Ford.
35 Secretary of State for Education and Science (1972) *Education: A Framework for Expansion*, London, HMSO, pp. 34–40.
36 *Universities Quarterly*, 1973, p. 133.
37 HENCKE, D. (1978) *Colleges in Crisis: The Reorganization of Teacher Training 1971–7*, Harmondsworth, Penguin, p. 48.
38 CRICK, B. (1981) 'Why Labour should think again about its policy for higher education', *Tribune*, 6 November, p. 5; MACLURE, S. (1982) 'British higher education policy', *Political Quarterly*, 53, p. 259.

39 STEVENS, A. (1979) 'Universities: What Boyson is up to', *The Observer*, 26 August.
40 HAMPSON, K. (1977) 'Murder, he says', *The Guardian*, 19 July.
41 Conservative Political Centre, Political Contact Programme: summary of reports received from discussion groups on . . . further and higher education, March 1979, mimeo, 1–2.
42 *Times Higher Education Supplement*, 1 January 1982.
43 BROOKE, P. (1985) 'Public expenditure constraints' in JAQUES, D. and RICHARDSON, J. (Eds) *The Future for Higher Education*, Guildford, Society for Research into Higher Education, p. 73.
44 DAINTON, SIR FREDERICK (1981) *op cit*, p. 11. Lord Flowers, in 1984, described the indifference of the local population to Imperial College when it arranged open days, University of Reading, *Bulletin*, no. 175, 1984, p. 9.
45 Sir Keith Joseph, interview with Ray Footman, University of Reading, *Bulletin*, no. 186, 1985, p. 9.
46 Norman Tebbit, speech to the Glass Manufacturers Association, reported in *Times Higher Education Supplement*, 26 November 1982.
47 Sir Keith Joseph, address reported in University of Reading, *Bulletin*, no. 180, 1985, p. 7.
48 Secretary of State for Education and Science *et al.* (1985) *The Development of Higher Education into the 1990s*, London, HMSO, passim (quotations are from pp. 4, 28 and 31).
49 Joseph, interview with Footman, pp. 7–8.
50 Secretary of State for Education and Science *et al.* (1987) *Higher Education: Meeting the Challenge*, London, HMSO, pp. iv–v and 1–2.
51 *ibid.*, iv, chapter 3.
52 See SILVER, H. and BRENNAN, J. (1988) *Liberal Vocationalism*, London, Methuen, chapter 14.
53 Conservative and Unionist Teachers' Association, memorandum submitted to the Robbins Committee (1963) *Higher Education, Evidence — Part One, Vol. E*, London, HMSO, p. 1422.

Chapter 6

*Intentions and Outcomes: Vocationalism in Further Education**

Vocationalism in Contexts

British further education (or what the Americans normally call post-secondary education, excluding 'higher education') provides, more than any other sector of education, consistently clear examples of the interplay of policy and pragmatism. It is that part of the system that is required to be, and by definition is intended to be, most rapidly responsive to economic and social change. It combines, in its various forms, a basis on which to meet rapidly changing technological and manpower needs, and possibilities of responding also to the shifting pressures of social and demographic change through, for example, demands for access to skills training or second-chance entry to the formal education system by minority groups or adults. In the colleges of further education and in the structures established in the 1980s under the Manpower Services Commission (MSC) the sector's pre-employment functions have been a constant focus of tension between the policy intentions of government seeking to formulate long-term goals and solve immediate economic problems, the definition (not always the same as that of government) by employers of their priority needs, and the 'educational' or 'vocational' targets of colleges and the bodies which validate their awards. The tension has also been between what is expected and what is feasible, as well as between rival interpretations of how science, technology, skills, general studies, or any other aspect of the curriculum or the process is best approached, and with what content or emphasis.

At the heart of further education and its policies is the concept of vocationalism. In the complex field of further education it is difficult to map the changing meanings of the concept in terms of policies and plans

* This chapter is based on research funded by the Further Education Unit.

and practice. How the concept is interpreted, implemented or evaded in secondary education and in higher education reflect back on what is considered appropriate and possible in this sector. It supplements — and in some cases duplicates — what is attempted in schools. It provides alternatives to — and in some cases alternative paths into — higher education. It prepares for work as it is and may become — and in some cases, given the rapidity of change and the slowness of response, as it used to be. What this chapter attempts to do, therefore, is to look at questions of change, in policy and practice, as embodied in some features of the recent history of further education and training, with an eye particularly to changing expressions or understandings of vocationalism. The 1980s saw developments of a 'new' vocationalism and a 'new' further education, vocational preparation and pre-vocational education, basic skills and work-related training, cores, competences and modules, new schemes and structures, changing concepts and policies, reviews of contents, levels, assessment and curricula, newly-expressed enthusiasms and resistances. In further education, as well as in other levels of the educational system, it is possible, amidst the complexities, to focus on the question: what has been *meant* by the 'vocational'?

The question suggests different emphases if approached in different ways, but there are common aspects also. If the focus is on ranges of courses, the intentions are those of policy-makers and providers, examining and validating bodies, with attention to conceptions of the practical and the theoretical, balances of education and training, options and tracks, occupational outcomes in the labour market. If the focus is on specific courses, the intentions are those of scheme designers and institutional decision-makers, with attention to the relevance of the skills to be acquired, to the student, the employer, the local conditions. If the focus is on the teacher or the student, the intentions involve considerations of choice and expectation, styles of teaching and learning, implementation and development. Underlying the discussion, whatever the focus, there will be a set of recurring questions — about the relationship between further education or vocational education and the economy, the needs of the labour market, the student's personal education, the phasing of specific knowledge or skills acquisition, the extent and nature of job-related preparation, available models of course design and access to experience. Although a study of vocationalism relates to the aspirations and expectations of students and staff, institutions and authorities, agencies and policy-makers, the essential focus is the explicit and inexplicit intentions of curricula, the goals set for courses, and their sub-structures and processes. The study of the curriculum in these terms in British further education has only a recent history, but what has emerged in the 1970s and 1980s has included sustained research and debate, and an output that has often

been more concentrated and incisive than equivalent work on schools or higher education.

One crucial reason for the previous absence of serious attention to further education curricula was the status of further education itself in the British educational system — its image as 'low-level training' rather than 'education', lacking in a credible knowledge base, combining part-time preparation for low-level qualifications with 'second chance' opportunities for those who had not made it in the 'real' or 'mainstream' educational process. Even at the higher levels of certificate and diploma preparation, further education was seen as concerned with relatively low status employments, with routine teaching of routine information and routine skills for routine jobs.

Although other countries, in Europe, North America and elsewhere shared some of these public (and particularly academic) attitudes to further education, the particular history of British industry, apprenticeship and schooling gave further education in the late nineteenth and through the twentieth century its ghetto image and identity. British understandings of a liberal or academic education left technical, vocational or further education little space in which to develop either status or the kind of informed debate and scholarship that were often available to schools and higher education.

Until the late 1970s the further education curriculum was largely the province of examining bodies, concerned about the specific knowledge and experience relevant or appropriate to specific employments, and occasionally about the overall balance of studies — in terms of general or liberal studies, for example. Economic pressures, or the concerns of professional bodies, might also produce pressures for change, but debate about the purposes of further education was rarely at the level attained by discussion of the curriculum of the university in the late nineteenth century, or of the curricula of secondary schools in the early decades of this century.

Given the lack of a strong tradition of research-related, curriculum-focussed discussion in further education, it is remarkable how intense and wide-ranging the debate and its attendant research and analysis have been since the mid-1970s. Much of it has been generated by economic pressures, by unemployment and by the politics of alternative approaches to work-related post-secondary education, but this does not minimize the intensity and range of the work that has belatedly taken place. The process began with the Labour government of the mid-1970s, and continued under the Conservatives after 1979. While the spur was unemployment, economic inefficiency and social dislocations, and while the results were often judged to be mere palliatives, the curriculum and purposes of established further education and new programmes entering the field

were for the first time brought into a central position in the history of British education.

The questions which underlay the challenges to further education from the second half of the 1970s concerned the definition of the employment needs to be met (or the unemployment problems to be faced) and the ability of existing further education provision to deliver what was needed. The creation of the Manpower Services Commission and the broadening of its operations highlighted the uncertainties. Patient criticism of some aspects of further education turned, in the new economic and political circumstances, into a crisis, with accusations that established further education was inflexible or irrelevant, didactic or teacher-centred, unresponsive, patronizing, elitist, uncaring of the unskilled or less able, out of step with real needs[1]. Careful advocates of a 'new FE' pointed to the 'cascade of young people' for whom there was no existing provision.[2] The Further Education Unit (FEU), in one of its most influential documents, talked of 'improving the learning opportunities and the transition to working life of that 50 per cent of our 16–19-year-old population which is not currently well served by our education and training systems'.[3] The argument gathered momentum that established further education was as restrictive and even selective as the 'A' level stream of the secondary school.[4] Focus began to turn to those school leavers, unemployed or entering employment with little or no opportunity for further education or training, those whose job destinations were uncertain, or whose abilities had in the past been disregarded in the planning of further education provision.[5]

Attention turned to the curriculum at all levels — to its relevance to jobs and the hazards of unemployment and underemployment. Industrial and economic performance forced consideration of the adaptability of students qualifying at upper levels of the system and their responsiveness to the fast moving changes of post-industrial society. Debate centred on breadth and general education, job-specific training, work-based and college-based programmes, the possibility and nature of appropriate training for skill and competence, within purposes defined as education or as training, or some sought-after amalgam of the two. Outside the system there were attentive and often hostile audiences — politicians were passing judgment, demands were inconsistent, short-term and long-term goals suggested were often incompatible, and in its attempts to play many roles further education found itself confused and on the defensive.

What emerged from the middle of the 1970s was a series of attempts to promote greater articulation of education and work at school and further education levels. As the 'new vocationalism' took shape it was subjected to a variety of interpretations — as a common sense response to economic decline; as the modernization of training for industry and of industry itself;

as a new and blatant form of social control; or as (almost by accident) increased access to post-secondary education.

There is a clear beginning of this process in the post-war period, as governments, employers and other agencies sought to develop appropriate — though not always similarly interpreted — emphases for technical and industrial education and training. Government White Papers on technical education in the late 1950s and early 1960s were paralleled by employers' efforts to describe 'training for skill' — following which and a White Paper in 1962 came the Industrial Training Act of 1964. The immediate predecessors of the movement from the late 1970s included the Haslegrave Report of 1969[6] and the ensuing creation of the Technician and Business Education Councils (TEC and BEC) in 1973–74, and the variety of government sponsored schemes beginning with TOPS (Training Opportunities) in 1972, and followed by the UVP (Unified Vocational Programme) and YOP (Youth Opportunities Programme) over the next six years. Involved was a sporadic operation, responsive to events, in the context of the relentless decline of the economy.

In the nineteenth century, given the industrial pre-eminence established in the period of the 'first Industrial Revolution', British education had seen little necessity for, and in many respects resisted, the incorporation of scientific and technical studies into mainstream education. The formation of a technical sector moved slowly from its mechanics institute stage through the work promoted by the Department of Science and Art, and the growth at the end of the century of what were to become the technical colleges. The haphazard and often ephemeral provision of the nineteenth century was often unclear about its constituencies and goals. Commissions investigating 'technical instruction' in the 1860s and 1880s made recommendations which ranged from improved elementary education to the 'technical education of foremen, managers, and above all, the leaders of industry'.[7] By the beginning of the twentieth century an incipient system of technical education was providing for the needs of apprentices in some areas of employment, and science had secured a firmer foothold in the school curriculum. The legacy of the struggle to establish scientific and technical strands in education was one of poor status, and the target population for technical studies had been identified as primarily male and working class.

The status of science, technical, craft or commercial studies was never secure in the twentieth century, especially following the collapse in the first decade of the experiment with higher grade schools biased towards a scientific, technical and practical curriculum. In Britain, as in the United States, controversy around the interpretation of these 'vocational' developments was fierce in the early decades of the century, and there were important attempts to confront the issues of the relationship between

traditional 'liberal' education and various forms of technical and practical training. For John Dewey, discussing schooling in the United States, a liberal or academic education *was* related to preparation for work and living — to preparation for leadership roles in a range of occupations. The question was not *whether* the school should prepare for working life, but *how it should do so:*

> ... the real issue is not the question whether an industrial education is to be added on to a more or less mythical cultural elementary education, but what sort of an industrial education we are to have.

What children received in elementary schools already was, in his view, merely a crude form of vocational training. Reading, writing, arithmetic and a smattering of other things 'are what the great mass of those who leave our schools leave with... These things, when nothing else is added on to them, are pretty nearly pure economic tools'.[8] In Britain, A.N. Whitehead strongly rejected any antithesis between the liberal and the technical, and proposed an approach to education which would be 'liberal technical'.[9]

Although there continued in Britain to be experiments with 'central schools' and 'secondary technical' schools, and although the security of science in the school curriculum became assured, the status of the vocational and of institutions making provision for it continued to be low. The status reflected assumptions about the necessarily narrow and unreflective nature of technical studies, and an underlying anti-industrialism inherited from Victorian England.[10] High status was associated with the gentrified, and a 'liberal' approach to education was seen as one which distanced itself from direct consideration of the world of work. Earlier conceptions of a 'vocation', as in fact a humane commitment to work as service, had been lost.[11]

By the end of the Second World War there were clear, separate tracks through the educational system at school level and beyond, and the range of vocationally-oriented studies was presented as largely discrete from those considered academic or liberal. The Ministry of Education in 1947 was concerned about the relationship between education and available occupations, and included in a pamphlet on *Further Education* a discussion of preparation for work and of provision for 'vocational' and 'general' education. In a pamphlet on the proposed county colleges for post-secondary part-time education the Ministry picked up the theme of vocational *versus* non-vocational education, describing the division as corresponding 'to some extent to reality ... yet too superficial to be of any great use'. It explained, in measured terms:

> One school of thought is apt to regard vocational work with deep suspicion as being something undertaken solely in the interests of industry and commerce and as having little to do with education properly conceived, while another regards vocational work as the real purpose of part-time education and anything else as being of minor and merely ornamental importance. Both these views, it is suggested, are mistaken. To hold that the acquisition of skill or knowledge in some specialized industry is uneducational is to limit the meaning of education unnecessarily and harmfully, and to perpetuate an attitude of mind that has already done ill service to the interests of young people. Equally, to regard anything but vocational training as being a waste of time is to encourage one-sidedness, narrowness and ignorance... The sub-division here adopted is into physical, practical, general and elective activities.[12]

Such attempts to marry or to overcome traditional distinctions was to prove profoundly difficult. The question of major cultural significance was whether anti-industrialism, anti-vocationalism, could be overcome by the adoption of conceptual strategies of the kind outlined in the Ministry's final sentence. Could the vocational content of further education be given serious attention and enter the mainstream of educational provision?

Some Old Arguments

A discussion of the vocational by George Tolley in 1979 underlined that what was once a simple discussion had become more complex for a cluster of clear reasons: it no longer related to preparation for existing jobs; the further education which provided it was also involved in general full-time education; the growth of unemployment had altered the pattern of vocational aims; and there were difficulties in responding to changing demands for types of skill. He concluded that 'we lack in this country an adequate understanding of and educational theory or framework for the vocational'.[13] More recently, a Conservative Minister agreed that discussion of the vocational goes to 'the heart of some of the oldest arguments about education'.[14] In its general and specific terms the vocational continues both to reflect some of these 'oldest arguments' and to grapple with increasing complexities.

The simplicities to which Tolley refers were visible particularly in the categorization of jobs and levels of jobs. A 1961 White Paper, for instance, tackled the training and general education needs of three traditional clienteles of technical education — technicians, craftsmen and operatives, the latter two categories needing different versions of the vocational, with

more or less specific skills, more or less broad education courses, and different versions of 'mental flexibility'.[15] City and Guilds provision of 'Further education for operatives' and 'Further education for craftsmen' made similar distinctions in its definitions of the categories, with implications for the degree of skill, 'technical grounding', general education and the development of the 'whole man'.[16]

Within employment, across boundaries of definitions and practice, between school and further education, in the spectrum of vocational qualifications from school to higher education, blurred edges and complexities have appeared. Even more than when Dewey argued that in the relationship between education and work both sides of the equation were changing and needed to change further, typologies have become subject to rapid change. New professions and semi-professions have appeared, new market conditions have developed, and new and unstable skill requirements have appeared. The vocational, as a response to those conditions, has itself become less clear, conceptually and in practice.

One thread in the old arguments was the narrowness of job-specific vocational training as against broader educational processes. Almost all discussions of technical, vocational or further education since the Second World War have addressed the issue of narrowness. At national policy levels, for example, the Carr Saunders Report on *Education for Commerce* in 1949 pointed out that with the exception of bookkeeping late nineteenth-century Department of Science and Art courses had not been 'narrowly vocational', and it regretted that the absence of a Higher National Certificate (HNC) for commerce had led to the establishment of 'schemes of vocational training ... some narrow in conception'.[17] A government White Paper on technical education in 1956 stressed that 'technical education must not be too narrowly vocational or too confined to one skill or trade'.[18] The Coldstream Report on *Vocational Courses in Colleges and Schools of Art* suggested in 1962 the need to extend the 'range and extent of vocational training', but

> ... even so it would be wrong ... to provide for students ... courses which are too soon or too narrowly tied to particular industrial techniques and processes ... general education in art and design is essential in all vocational courses.[19]

The Haslegrave Report on technician courses considered that 'further education courses have a wider role to perform than merely to provide the vocational education to match a person's vocational training', although this was one of their most important functions.[20]

A clear illustration of the issues involved was contained in the Report of the Crowther Committee on *15 to 18* in 1959. In its attempt to disentangle what was meant by a 'practical' education, and to raise its

esteem, the Report focussed on its current 'pejorative' usage, which it saw as to some degree related to the prestige of the full-time 'academic' course as against the 'part-time route, which, for all its merits, has the disadvantages of requiring a prior entry into the labour market, of being rather narrowly vocational, of being very arduous . . .'. The 'practical' alternative to the academic route need not be mainly technical, and 'still less confined to the special needs of a narrow range of occupations'.[21] In one way or another public policy discussion continued through the 1960s and 1970s to express concern about the dangers of narrow technical and vocational courses.

That vocationalism did not necessarily equate with narrowness was also being widely conceded. In general terms Entwistle, for example, looked at the interlock between conceptions of general and vocational education and suggested an approach to the vocational which incorporated a wider sense of the moral, social, aesthetic, religious, economic and political questions of the work situation.[22] Melling has emphasized the conception of a 'broad vocational slant',[23] which can encompass goals of the citizen and the 'good man', the employee and the person, a process which avoids the 'dedicated output' of the single occupation.[24] Part of the history of vocational provision is the persistent attempt to produce the packaged course intended for a specific occupation or narrow range of occupations — with the ensuing problems of review as the labour market has felt the impact of declining industries, deskilling, and the impact of new technologies.

The pressure of economic uncertainty has been towards less specific courses,[25] and at least in stated objectives moves towards wider interpretations of vocational objectives. The considerable range of approaches to skills and competences in the past decade has signalled such a search for wider interpretations, to match both educational goals and the flexibilities required in the employment market. The conception of 'vocational preparation' which gained ground from the mid-1970s most clearly expressed this aspiration for generous interpretations, for a form of combination of education and training which, in the analysis of the FEU, implied a content of 'communication, numeracy, decision-making and problem-solving, physical and manipulative skills, interpersonal relationships, moral values, social, political and economic awareness, learning skills, self-confidence and adaptability.[26]

The long search for non-specific and unconstraining understandings of the vocational has at times evaded, or even strengthened, the conception of technical subjects as inherently illiberal that has been common for most of this century. The basic change in the versions of the vocational that has emerged in recent years has been that at least in the intention (or

some might say the rhetoric) the target is not only, or not narrowly, defined as employability.

Recent approaches to skill and competence, and attempts to embody in structures such concepts as cores, foundations, cross-disciplinary activities, work-study relationships, and the general or liberal education components that were developed from the late 1950s and were either abandoned or transmuted into other things — all reflect the old arguments, including about education versus training, and the liberal versus the vocational.

What was at stake in the late nineteenth-century debates, and is still prominent in international discussion in the late 1980s, is the fear of a predominant emphasis on the acquisition of skills at the expense of other educational values. This fear was as central to the defence of a 'liberal education' in the universities in the second half of the nineteenth century as it was to the protection of the grammar school curriculum in the 1900s, or resistance to the 'new vocationalism' in the 1980s. An interesting feature of opposition to vocationalism is that it has brought together, albeit with different ideologies and along different routes, critics from the 'traditionalist right' and the 'radical left'. Wiener's analysis of the decline of the industrial spirit identifies the mainsprings of British traditionalism, which the economic conditions of the 1980s compelled Conservative policy to confront. The radical critique saw in the new approaches to vocational preparation an attempt at a new consensus which one critic described as a 'social democratic repertoire'. The FEU's *A Basis for Choice*, he suggested, assumed 'that educational interventions can provide at least some solution to economic and social problems', and assumed 'a correspondence between the needs of industry and the needs of those who pass through one-year pre-employment courses'. Profiling was an attack on 'the centre of student resistance': 'it attempts to colonize and overcome student resistance by working on students' consciousness, by changing their ways of thought through negotiation'.[27] Vocational preparation was seen as a new legitimation of the essentials of industrial capitalism or yet another way of 'blaming' the individual for deficiencies (for example in social skills) and of reducing discontent and promoting acceptable behaviour.[28]

All of these views indicate how far British post-secondary education still was, in the post-war decades, from resolving the tensions amongst technical education and apprentice training, general education and job-related courses, the further education of the minority of school leavers and the largely unacknowledged needs of the majority, the intentions of the county college proposals and the failure to implement them. Models of 'work-based' or 'experience-related' education had little impact until the 1980s.[29] There was little support for the kind of view expressed by Entwistle in 1970:

> vocational education is a universal human need, a means towards every man's personal fulfilment and increasingly essential if we are to confront the industrial challenge of automation ... vocational education is a human imperative, capable of being a liberal experience.[30]

A widening conception of work and pressures towards preparation for life and not just for a first job also made slow progress in Britain until the late 1970s.[31]

Against such backgrounds, it was the lack of a theory of the vocational that led George Tolley to suggest that there were four essential questions to be addressed: what is competence; what is the setting in which knowledge and skills will be applied; what personal responsibility must be accepted in the job that is done; and what is the basis of knowledge and attitudes upon which change and mobility will be brought about? He emphasizes the importance of the presence of general education ('paramount in the area of the vocational') and of transferable skills, and he adds: 'a search for relevance in teaching must enhance awareness and meaning; it must not anchor the mind within the constraints of the present'.[32] The underlying tension in the developments of the 1980s was between any translation into action of these kinds of broad interpretations, and pressures for specific training in response to immediate needs.

These arguments overlap, of course, with considerations of the vocational both in school curricula and in higher education. The discussion of the vocational in secondary education has had, just as in further education, difficulties associated with status and social class. The technical and the vocational have been widely associated with manual skills, and therefore seen as largely 'working class' by definition. Craft subjects at school level were institutionalized mainly as related to 'trades' and manual employment, either in separate schools or as tracks or concentrations within schools. Schools and their curricula reflected assumptions that children would be heading towards different levels of social and occupational activity,[33] and the justification — when it was not directly in class terms, was in terms of meritocratic selection. Dewey, in the American context, argued strongly against *separate* vocational provision, believing the vocational content to be part of the normal school curriculum for all children. Entwistle has similarly argued against a false dichotomy between the needs of the child and of the adult, and for the need for schools to develop an interest in work as part of the normal educational process.[34]

In the 1850s Herbert Spencer thought that any visitor from space visiting a British school would assume that all Britons were celibate, that the family and child-rearing did not exist, so totally absent were such matters from the curriculum.[35] Similarly in the 1970s and 1980s the

argument has been that schooling has taken little or no explicit account of the world of work.[36] Many educational developments have consequently had in view a closer school understanding of the applicability of skills and knowledge. The 'Education for Capability' movement underlined competences, problem-solving, the range of learning experiences appropriate for handling the processes of modern society.[37] The FEU's *A Basis for Choice*, and its interpretation of skills and competences, became of interest to schools as well as to further education.[38] At the centre of the development of interest in pre-vocational preparation was an emphasis on activity-based learning, on the applicability of knowledge and skills to practical, employment-oriented contexts[39] — an emphasis, as we shall suggest, not unrelated to discussions of a national core curriculum for schools. There have remained, of course, unaltered dangers of interpreting movements in these directions as being lower-status forms of non-academic learning for working-class children as a new form of streaming, a charge faced by the introduction of the Technical and Vocational Education Initiative (TVEI) — beginning at the pilot stage in 1982.

TVEI was conceived as work-related in all of the aims it defined — to attract 14–18-year-olds to 'seek the qualifications/skills which will be of direct value to them at work', to enable them to be better equipped to enter the world of employment, to understand more clearly the practical application of the qualifications for which they were working, to learn how to solve 'the real-work problems they will meet at work', and other practical measures to bridge education and work.[40] The MSC interpreted these intentions as widening and enriching the school curriculum, developing skills and interests, enabling pupils to learn how to learn, and directing them towards a fuller life and a creative use of their abilities.[41]

None of this necessarily means the creation of new 'technical streams', although that may well have been an intention. Anne Jones argued, for example, that within the comprehensive school there were in this approach technological opportunities for all pupils, and possible answers to old problems:

> ... the aims and objectives of the Young proposals could be implemented within the comprehensive system in a way which gave access to all pupils, of all abilities, without closing down their options, or depriving them of a balanced education which included expressive and creative elements as well as basic skills and competencies.[42]

Within the TVEI framework, therefore (and within other schemes that preceded or paralleled TVEI at local levels),[43] it was possible to see the clear elements of a vocational programme accessible to all children, and

not — as Dewey had warned — distorted into a separate track. Generously interpreted and implemented, TVEI could be an approach to the vocationalism which had surfaced briefly in Britain at the end of the nineteenth century and had been killed off in an effort to defend the centrality of the grammar school model to any emergent secondary education system. It was important, as the DES pointed out in 1984, that in the fourth and fifth years of schooling covered by TVEI, courses which were designed 'to foster narrow vocational skills', popular though these might be with some pupils, should 'not displace courses of a more general character'.[44]

The intentions of TVEI were to develop a diversity of technical and vocational provision, interpreted differently by local authorities and their schools, and available to pupils at all levels of ability in the age range. Whatever else, TVEI was the first serious attempt in the century to recover for the technical and the vocational at the level of the secondary school an enhanced status alongside the 'academic', an escape route from hierarchical notions of applied knowledge as being 'devoid of intellectual content'.[45] The essential questions posed by the introduction of TVEI were two-fold: at what stage in the educational system was it appropriate to introduce a direct association with the world of work, and were there major differences between the aims of vocational provision at the different levels? Post-secondary education was finding that its frontier with schools was increasingly blurred.

If vocationalism was a sensitive issue at school level, with established values needing to be protected or modified, the same was true in higher education. Throughout the expansionist 1960s and early 1970s there were basic tensions — often disguised by the very process of expansion — between the development of a more 'responsive' higher education, and the protection of the basic 'liberal' education values of the curriculum. This was a tension not only between subjects and disciplines, but also between institutions and sectors, as the landscape of higher education increasingly contained institutions other than universities — the polytechnics at the end of the 1960s and the colleges of higher education from the mid-1970s.

The twin goals of the traditional university were to teach the liberal and humane subjects, and, from the late nineteenth century in Britain, to prepare for new liberal professions — in addition to such ancient 'vocations' as the church, the law and medicine. Now there were the demands of new student constituencies, new occupational requirements, and new definitions of their higher education 'mission' by polytechnics and colleges. These had traditions seen as more vocational than the majority of university provision — their often predominant technical programmes; the strength of their employment-oriented degrees in art and design

or teacher education or business studies; their part-time, day release or full-time pre-degree courses, their certificate and diploma courses in social work, community nursing or other service-related professions.

Across these higher education diversities was felt the growing impact of economic stringency, policy direction, and demands for firmer manpower planning and a greater direct contribution to the economy. The balance of provision was deliberately shifted away from the arts and social sciences towards science and technology. Government statements increasingly emphasized the vocational contribution expected of higher education and the closer relationship needed with industry and the world of employment.

In this context, the liberal and the vocational, often expressed in vague and ambiguous terms, were in conflict, as responsiveness to political and economic imperatives confronted liberal values and university autonomy. The polytechnics inherited strong traditions of industrial, economic and professional responsiveness from the colleges out of which they grew — encouraged first by the National Council for Techological Awards and then, from 1964, by the Council for National Academic Awards (CNAA). A recent study has considered the nature of the vocationalism of these institutions and the ways in which those responsible for courses view the relationship between their 'academic' commitments and their vocational intentions.[46] The study found it necessary to move away from a simple dichotomy between vocational and liberal (or general or non-vocational) courses or education, and produced a typology of courses which to different extents acted as requirements for entry to specific or a range of occupations. It looked in detail at the course descriptions of a number of engineering and business studies degrees, and course leaders were interviewed in four institutions — two polytechnics and one college of higher education in England, and one college in Scotland. Other subject areas (architecture, estate management and town planning) were also examined, and the principals or directors were interviewed. Regardless of the differences of subject matter and employment outcomes, what emerged was a clear commitment on the part of the courses and the institutions to an induction of students into the problems of the 'real world' — in the sandwich element of the courses, or in the processes of the courses themselves, or both. In many respects the courses were seen to be different from traditional liberal arts or social science courses, in that the former were more conscious of the future occupational needs of the students. Course teams balanced the requirements of professional institutions with the validation standards of the CNAA. The students recruited generally had clear targets, and most of them went into the areas of employment for which the courses prepared them. The actual outcomes depended on the structure of the courses, the quality of the students and

the staff, and other factors, but there was throughout an appreciation of the world of work as represented by a course, a degree and a vocational preparation in engineering or business, and by an institution whose explicit concern was with the appropriateness of its offerings to the employment expectations of its students.

At the same time, however, the pursuit of relevant skills, knowledge and experience did not mean, in the eyes of those who designed, administered and taught these courses, that the traditional liberal values of higher education were being abandoned. There was a concern for independent thought on the part of students — though in engineering the quality of students recruited often militated against this. There was an emphasis in engineering on the integrative value of design, the need for creativity, the centrality of problem-solving. Simulation, projects, case studies and other strategies were aimed at active learning by students. Courses and teaching and learning methods could be narrow and information-focussed, but were not necessarily so. Many of those interviewed in the whole range of subjects felt that they were to some extent sharing a higher education approach with the humanities and social sciences, with the essential difference that their own students were preparing to solve real-world problems.

Different traditions of higher education were here perceived as being brought together — those common to a 'traditional' higher education and those associated with the purposes of the technical, art and commercial colleges from which the polytechnics had originally emerged and whose purposes they had continued and strengthened. The study therefore proposed an approach to these features of higher education in terms of a hybrid description — that of a 'liberal vocationalism', one which moved away from extreme positions of a liberal education with no explicit interest in employment outcomes, and a narrow vocationalism which was concerned only with immediate employment requirements. Neither seemed appropriate to an understanding of higher education in the conditions of the late twentieth century. The concerns involved are not unrelated to those in further education policy and practice.

Policy

The policy intentions of governments, government departments, national agencies of employers and others, examination bodies and indeed all those local authorities and institutions engaged in these processes, have spanned a range of possible outcomes — not always explicit, often combined, overlapping or contradictory. Across recent decades policy-making has been concerned with manpower planning or the development of new

areas of study and employment; access; the improvement — judged by one criterion or another — of curricula or their delivery; improved relations or connections between further education and employers; the initiation of new national projects or administrative machineries; responses to new economic, industrial or commercial situations; changes in the provision and utilization of resources; improved coordination. Within these policy directions emphases have varied, but in curricular terms the overall message has been concerned with the responsiveness of further education to these external signals and needs, and particularly with the provision of courses appropriate to students at all levels who face rapidly changing employment markets.

Further education has always had to respond to the needs of employers — particularly in the case of students released from employment for the purpose — though even in this case there is no easy agreement amongst employers and their organizations as to what should be provided or who should decide. Attention to the needs of students, set alongside the needs defined for specific occupations, also arouses uncertainties as to balance and the control of the decision-making process. Over recent decades there have been successful attempts to weaken the relationship between course content and specific, 'permanent' jobs. Policy documents have reflected this weakening relationship in principle, as well as an increasing emphasis on the processes of courses as reflected in the ways students learn, and the outcomes of courses as reflected in the quality and characteristics of students.

Over three decades this has meant an accent on some degree of student flexibility, though the thread has not always been clearly visible, and other priorities have obscured it. The 1956 White Paper on Technical Education clearly stated a recurring message of the 1950s and 1960s: 'technical education must not be too narrowly vocational or too confined to one skill or trade'. The theme was developed around a concept which, in different guises, was to remain central to policy formulation:

> Versatility has been the aim of a classical education; technical studies should lead to a similar versatility ... grounded on the fundamentals of mathematics and science ... all technical progress rests upon the common foundation of language... Versatility and grasp of principles are indispensable for enabling those who are being trained to-day to keep up-to-date and play their part effectively in the conditions of the future.[47]

Although the White Paper was primarily concerned with Advanced Further Education (AFE), it was not exclusively so, and the final sentence of the quotation refers specifically to technicians and craftsmen. Although the nature of 'fundamentals' and 'common foundations' was to be a focus of

debate in future decades, the personal and employment versatilities at stake here were to be permanent features of future policy formulations. What did not remain constant were the means of achieving such versatility (and that vocabulary was to be replaced by others), and the role of work-centred or work-based elements in the process. The obstacles and temptations of unversatile course structures were not, of course, disposed of by these and later formulations.

Policy-making in the 1970s and 1980s not only brought vocationally conceived education and training closer to intended outcomes of student adaptability and manpower mobility, it also placed considerable stress on work-related vocational preparation, on skills derived from studies of the workplace, and — as the MSC gained in political authority — on a variety of courses with aims defined outside the traditional educational services nationally and locally. The question ultimately became not just what the connection was between vocational courses and their employment outcomes, but how close to work the courses themselves should be, and who should decide what was appropriate vocational content.

Further education has always been about work — though with adjacent purposes connected with their 'second chance', 'tertiary education', community and traditionally 'non-vocational' roles. The examining and validating bodies which have governed their curricula have always had strong commitment to relating their schemes and courses to the world in which knowledge and skills acquired by students are applied. City and Guilds typically was represented in 1978 as providing 'society, industry, education and the individual with a standard setting, testing, and certificating service... We stand as a bridge between the education system and the world of work'.[48] In 1986 the Royal Society of Arts could explain, also typically, that it 'continues to serve as a liaison between the various practical arts and sciences and their areas of application'.[49] In the 1970s and 1980s the world of work was brought more forthrightly, however, into conceptions of and strategies for the vocational in post-secondary education.

The issue is international: as one American commentator put it — 'even kindergartners are learning about the world of work'[50] — which was certainly to become true of the British primary school with the introduction of the National Curriculum in 1989. In further education more than anywhere models of work experience and work-focussed study have become central to policy and planning. The *First Policy Statement* issued by the Business Education Council expressed the view that 'the student who has work experience gains greater benefit from a business education course than the full-time student with no work experience', and this was true of both prior and concurrent work experience. The Council would therefore encourage courses 'which incorporate a compulsory work experi-

ence in some form'. BTEC, in its 1984 consultation on *Policies and Priorities*, underlined the value of work placements as a means of interrelating education and training.[51] Such statements reflected the widespread support in the 1960s and afterwards for forms of work experience prior to, or as an integral part of, courses of full-time study in such employment-related areas. At other levels, however, the motivation was different. From the 1973 White Paper which proposed the establishment of the MSC, the discussion of further education was related to a firmer consideration of the working of the labour market (and in this case, of the Industrial Training Boards).

One of the clearest policy statements to point in this new direction and to its implications for further education was the Labour government's 1979 consultative paper *A Better Start in Working Life*. The broad aim of vocational preparation, it suggested, was to give young people a better start in working life through the acquisition of skills 'needed to carry out specific tasks at work', and the development of attitudes and knowledge which would enable them to 'play their part in the working community and help them work more effectively'. The aim, in addition to developing skills and understanding their working environment (placing their job 'in the context of the organization as a whole'), was also to exploit 'the new opportunities for learning, and the new motivation, engendered by the change from the status of a pupil at school to that of a wage-earner in the world of work'. The experience of UVP and YOP had demonstrated the importance of relating vocational preparation 'very closely to experience at work'.[52] The rapid growth of unemployment amongst school leavers strengthened the policy emphasis on this close relationship. *Training for Jobs* in 1984 underlined that training must be 'firmly work oriented and lead to jobs ... training and vocational education must become more responsive to employment needs at national and local level'.[53] Further government documents in 1985 and 1986 reinforced the conception of vocational education and training (the dual phrase constantly used) as preparation for work in a technological society — for example the extension of YTS into a second year, with opportunities to gain qualifications 'practical and relevant to employment'.[54]

The concern expressed in such documents — that the further education system had taken insufficient account of the work skills needed by large numbers of school leavers and others — was accompanied by attempts to itemize those skills. The economic and political motivation for these concerns related to wider considerations — most of them controversial — including the causes of unemployment, the suitability of work experience and job creation schemes, the deployment of public resources, and the alternative route increasingly represented by the MSC. The emphasis on a 'work-based' rather than a 'college-based' model, or the

work-focussed content of courses had, however, historical as well as ideological roots in earlier attempts to link education and work. In the 1980s such explorations were being conducted by the FEU, BTEC, the MSC, and the differences amongst them — and sometimes between them and previous 'instrumentalist' approaches — lay in the emphases and the solutions rather than in the exercise itself. The nature of the vocational was now being expressed in terms of skills and competences, and as employment outcomes intended to be accomplished by courses and experience geared to the workplace.

The most direct attempt at such matching was that associated with a study of 'skill ownership' and 'occupational training families' conducted for the MSC. The study aimed to analyze the key purposes of the jobs studied, in order — by clustering these in 'families' — to highlight the transferable skills that could be taught. The proposed learning scheme based on these 'OTFs' had four main components:

— jobs are grouped into 11 OTFs;
— the Key Purpose of each OTF is stated;
— a system of Learning Objectives for each OTF highlights its Key Competencies;
— Transfer Learning Objectives are stated for each OTF which will enable trainees to become effective in new jobs within that OTF.

The emphasis throughout was on adaptability within a range of jobs and unpredictable futures: 'ownership of skills is the ability to redeploy learned skills and knowledge in new and unfamiliar circumstances. This is perhaps the most important way in which young people will judge the value of YTS'. The study itemizes not only the OTFs and their purposes, but also the different available approaches and benefits.[55] Despite the scheme's emphasis on interrelating the diverse elements of its analysis and proposals, there were difficulties. The FEU, in response, emphasized the potentially harmful outcomes of policy intentions and operational mechanisms based on weak or insufficiently thought-through concepts, with inadequate attention to the training methods and learning processes which governed the transferability of skills. The FEU's approach to work experience, participative learning, competence and transferable skills led to reservations about some of the directions followed with regard to occupational training families, or to narrowing interpretations of the broad-based character of vocational preparation which had been defined in the late 1970s and early 1980s.[56]

Understanding of the vocational was firmly located in the domain of skills and competences. When the Review of Vocational Qualifications (RVQ) was established, following the 1985 White Paper *Education and*

Training for Young People, it addressed issues of the low status of the vocational, the 'unhelpful' divide between the vocational and the academic, and other areas of certification and qualification at the levels with which we are concerned, but one of the most delicate issues discussed was the definition and implications of the vocational qualifications with which the RVQ group was dealing. It underlined that such qualifications were based on competences relevant to work, served the interests of employment and the individual, needed to be more directly related to work competences, put skills and knowledge together in the diagram, and proclaimed against mere examination-setting and in favour of certifying competence in work-based learning. It warned, however, against the trap of utilitarianism, the aim being employees 'in the round'.[37] As Jack Mansell put it, however: 'perhaps the most complex issue concerning RVQ is the question of who will define and own the competences to be certificated'.[38]

Skills and Structures

In any conception of what constitutes the vocational in further education it is clear that the acquisition of skills in preparation for performance in employment, or to improve performance, has become of central interest. That does not, however, simplify the issue. Certainly the concern with preparation for employment is more clear-cut in further education than in secondary education. The majority of students, part-time and full-time, in colleges of further education or on MSC or related programmes, are work-oriented in more direct ways than is the case in much of higher education. How broad and how flexible that work-oriented preparation should be, with what balance between 'education' and 'training', at what levels of further education, nevertheless remain questions still often in dispute. How clear a consensus there is on the nature of the skills to be acquired, and on the very meaning of 'skill', is also a critically important question.

The uncertain relationship between 'specific' and 'general' skills, for instance, has featured prominently in debates about the content of further education, both in Britain and in its equivalents elsewhere. In the United States it has been suggested that the battle over skills has been fought out essentially over these two conceptions of skill. The conventional wisdom has asserted the need to espouse general skills that are transferable between occupations in a changing economy — a view affirmed in vocational education legislation in the 1960s. In practice, however, 'training tends to be more specific'.[39] In Britain, the Youth Opportunities Programme and most other programmes and schemes since have postulated an

important role for college-based elements frequently defined as 'general vocational skills' or some variant of that concept — particularly 'basic' or 'social and life skills'. However, criticism regularly emerges of the narrow interpretation of skills in one context or another — for example, some of the interpretations of skill by the Industrial Training Boards or during the work of the Review of Vocational Qualifications,[60] and from the outset in the role of the National Council for Vocational Qualifications (NCVQ). There was controversy amongst employers' organizations, for example, about the NCVQ's commitment in principle to broad-based courses, and the NCVQ provoked in practice concern about its ability to implement such a commitment.

Considerable stress has been laid on certain kinds of skill which are themselves open to wide-ranging interpretation — for instance the communication and language skills which figured prominently in the policy and recommended practice of the Technician Education Council from the late 1970s, institutionalized in general and communication studies. Communication studies were presented as a broad range of skills, abilities and techniques — verbal, visual, logical, interpersonal, and self-reflective.[61] TEC and others also often stressed 'creative and manipulative' skills, in the case of TEC certificate and diploma programmes in art and design, but in higher certificate and higher diploma programmes in engineering also 'high level intellectual skills' (the latter through 'the development of analytical concepts and cross-disciplinary knowledge of theory and techniques and their application to the work situation').[62]

The conception of skills which went beyond applicability to a single employment or employer became increasingly emphasized in the second half of the 1970s as the notion of generic, rather than general skills, and their relationship to transferability was given serious attention. On the basis of research carried out in Canada, explored on a visit to Canada on behalf of the Further Education Unit in 1978 by Geoffrey Melling, the concept of generic, transferable skills became part of the stock-in-trade of many bodies in further education, including the MSC.[63] It was the notion of transferability that was particularly attractive, since at all levels it opened up possibilities of locating skills training in broad areas and pointing towards multiple employment opportunities, or the flexibilities needed for a changing employment market. The research which investigated these possibilities was most prominently that associated with the search for occupational training families (itself stemming from the earlier Canadian research), which were intended to make it possible to identify the broad clusters of skills required in each case.

The aims postulated for YTS pointed firmly in this direction of common, transferable skills:

> to achieve initial competence in an occupation;
>
> to be able to transfer knowledge and skills acquired in one occupation to other, possibly quite different occupations;
>
> to acquire knowledge and skills which they need to progress to further education and training in the same or different occupations; and
>
> to cope with the world outside employment.

This relationship between transfer and flexibility was the foundation of the Youth Training Scheme. Its core areas contained 'those skills which are common in a wide range of tasks and which are essential for competence in those tasks'. The common foundation was imperative for young people 'who have to keep their options open'. Core skills were those which could be used in a 'variety of situations'.[64] In a new and rapidly changing situation the focus on transferable, core skills reflected a growing sense that 'efficiency' had to be future-oriented, that the needs of the individual and of employment equated efficiency with flexibility.

The search for any range of skills also implied the possibility of identifying for all students, or at least for major constituencies of students, such 'core' or 'basic' skills. In the United States there were denials that 'basic skills' had anything to do with vocational education, and simply represented a shift from the attitudes and moral values associated with work in earlier decades to a concern in the 1980s with the basic skills that were part of the educational process for all.[65] In 1981 the FEU defined basic skills, which it considered a 'major component of vocational preparation', in the following terms:

> By (basic skills) we mean a level of ability, achievement and understanding in essential areas of knowledge and skill which will increase a young person's chance of making a success of adult and working life. These skills should be broad-based and transferable, rather than specific and job-restricted, and should include that range known as social and life skills.[66]

The FEU repeatedly rejected static or narrow interpretations of basic skills, and in doing so prompted one comment that 'the FEU's concept of skills has spread onto a much broader canvas, involving education as well as training'.[67]

The FEU's *A Basis for Choice*, first published in 1979, offered an approach to core skills which had echoes throughout further education programme-making. The FEU's extensive aims and objectives for this common core covered a great deal of ground: perspectives on young

people's roles in an adult society and world of work; a basis for decision-making for the future; development of physical and manipulative skills; satisfactory personal relationships; moral values, study skills, problem-solving, political and economic literacy, and various abilities to understand, take part in and assist in changing the modern world.[68]

It was an ambitious programme, on which other schemes — including the City and Guilds Vocational Preparation (General) course — were based.[69] The notion of 'cores', with one degree or another of breadth, pervaded the 1980s planning of YTS, Certificate of Pre-Vocational Education (CPVE) and Business and Technician Education (BTEC) Council courses. In various cases the core and some version of the occupational training family came together. The YTS core skills, as we have seen, were described as deriving from the investigation of skills needed in a wide variety of occupations, and were essential for competence in a range of tasks. The core skills programmes evolved were intended to be achieved by the students' active engagement, leading away from the passive learning that some critics considered too prevalent in previous further education provision at craft and similar levels. There were equally, however, suspicious that the very concept of core skills was limiting (a programme for a 'low-grade industrial android' in the words of one critic of the *ABC* core skills list).[70] Across many levels, however, the intention of the core and basic programmes being designed was to move towards active, problem-solving skills. Some of these were clearly expected to arise from the very range of what was intended — and in many of the policy documents and programme descriptions of the 1980s there are what can only be described as compendia of skills and skill components.

The original *ABC* list developed by the FEU contained twelve aims, each with a considerable breakdown of sub-objectives. The CGLI's Vocational Preparation (General) scheme was described in 1983 as a detailed but unified whole:

> Although the programme is described in terms of components it must be operated as a COHERENT and INTEGRATED whole NOT as a compendium of unrelated subjects, courses or skills. All elements overlap and reinforce one another in a way which is relevant to the students.

In operational terms the course was to cover 'common' and 'process' skills of various kinds and in a range of specified studies. Vocational preparation was elsewhere described as a combination of job skills, work skills, life skills and social skills. Hayes, in the OTF study, talks of life skills, product skills, process skills and other ranges of skills and competences which go beyond job-specific ones.[71]

Perhaps the closest to a compendium, however, was the detailed breakdown of aims and skills that emerged from the planning of CPVE. The 1984 Consultative Document stipulated some broad aims in terms of balance, differentiation, learning strategies, and curricular objectives — with a common core, vocational studies and additional studies examined in some detail. The skills to be acquired were practical, social and problem-solving, those of communication and numeracy, personal and career development, and others. In the specific modules that were issued in 1985 the target of each for the student was to be an 'extension of role exploration', but it was easy from these starting points for the modules to be seen as a catalogue of highly specific and limited objectives, within which the original intentions became relatively invisible.[72]

Compendia and lists do not, of course, necessarily imply disjointed curricula or learning. The *ABC* formulas were intended to be illustrative (and deliberately not prescriptive). The 'Education for Capability' manifesto in 1981 talked of competences around the core concept of 'personal competence', in this case in relation to secondary education:

> The range of necessary competence in the modern world includes not only the familiar basic skills, but also practical ability, the ability to get on with others, skill in solving real-life problems, and such attributes for a full and effective life as judgment, responsibility and reliability.

This, similarly, is a way of approaching the specifics of a curriculum.[73] We shall need to see, however, the implications in operational terms of the pointers towards specific skills and targets as they came to be interpreted in modules and units and the logistics of programme teaching.

It is undoubtedly important to situate 1980s meanings of the vocational in the development of these emphases. Competence, particularly under the influence of the FEU, became a more widely used concept in the mid-1980s, including by the Review of Vocational Qualifications and in government publications. 'Competency-based' approaches to teaching had been a prominent American development of the 1970s, but had become associated with the minute fracturing of the curriculum with a view to stipulating precise learning objectives, the mastery of which was to be immediately tested in highly objective forms.

In its British further education version of the 1980s the implications were somewhat different, expressed in broader terms, without the same testing implications that were uppermost in the American model. Competence was to be seen as *including* skills, but also knowledge, attitudes and experience. It was a broadly based approach to the learning of roles, it was specific and general, it was concerned with process and with integration.[74] Interestingly, the definitions and curricular implications of this approach

to competence laid stress on attitudes, which had been present in a minor form in earlier discussions, but now appeared as part of the central machinery of definition. It was a feature of the move away from passive learning to a view of competence which involved the experience and personal characteristics of the student.

Discussion of the vocational in this period had normally included the personal in some form. The new further education had been generally taken as addressing personal as well as 'academic' and 'technical' development. The view was emerging in the 1980s that competence in the workplace had as much to do with 'personal skills' as others, particularly where team relations and complex communication were involved. 'Social and life skills' (SLS) as a discrete concept arose out of some of those considerations, and also out of the anxieties about what was needed to 'cope' with unemployment.

The SLS component was in many instances associated with the general education element of courses. The forms of implementation were a significant feature of the YOP training schemes, and some critics regretted the narrowing down of its approach to social and life skills when YOP was replaced by the Youth Training Scheme in 1983. In the late 1970s the Manpower Services Commission was indeed committed to promoting SLS, the objectives of which it described in 1976 as including 'to determine the continuing needs of course members', and to develop 'ability to communicate ... ability to cope with adult life ... knowledge of local facilities ... the ability to cope with calculations associated with various jobs ... job seeking ability ...'.[75]

The relationship between SLS and general studies, the open-ended interpretations of what communication and 'coping with adult life' might mean, almost inevitably pointed towards conflict over the implementation of such objectives. Social and life skills were then deemphasized by the MSC, just as the FEU and others were attempting to build on the experience and develop approaches to SLS based on strategies for greater student involvement in the development of autonomous learning.[76] A Garnett College study found that the question of *attitudes* was often being sidestepped by calling them *skills*.[77] Within the discussions of SLS competence and balance, and connections between attitude and skill, personal and work characteristics were being addressed.

Americans were finding at the same time that there were difficult interpretative balances to be struck between the definition of skills as characateristics of jobs, and as characteristics of workers. The former were highlighted by the requirements of production, but the latter were being seen as an important determinant of productivity.[78] In that American context it was understood how difficult it was to assess the skill needs and personal qualities, and in Britain also it was to be seen to be difficult to

analyze the roles performed by employees at any level, and the nature and quality of the performance of individuals in those roles.[79]

Skills had therefore come to be discussed across such a broad range, and competence was being developed as an umbrella concept to incorporate skills and attitudes, knowledge and experience. Different interpretation pointed to different policy and programme implications. Education and training had still not been reconciled within a concept of vocational preparation, and there was constant tension between intention and implementation. Had the concept of the vocational been pinned down by reference to skill and competence?

The concept of skill has in fact been virtually defined out of existence. Interpretations of competence and capability bring vocational preparation in many respects into an almost synonymous relationship with any conception of 'education'. The emphasis on, and attempts to disaggregate, skills in the 1980s in particular have been operationally important in the strategies to develop provision for wider constituences of students, and to relate such provision to employment realities and student motivations. It could be argued, however, that the skills and competences being defined for further education have been not so much attempts to increase pressure towards vocationalism as belated efforts to help education *in general* to come to terms with the demands of the late twentieth century. It is in this that one important policy implication of changes in the components of vocationalism lies.

The objectives of new courses and schemes have, nevertheless, been most frequently defined in vocational terms, whatever other intentions they may have, and the perceived relationships between the focus on skills and competences on the one hand and the nature of course provision on the other hand have had important implications. There is no necessary connection between the 'vocationalism' of a scheme or programme and its structure, but relationships have emerged in some areas of course and programme development. The example of the YTS four aims and their implications indicates how the interpretation of broad-based or transferable skills can carry over into structures. The YTS core skills were seen as requiring a range of training styles, since they were about doing and thinking for oneself. They were not to be 'parcelled off' as separate 'topics'. The process of identifying tasks in work experience, deciding on the relevant skills, and developing an appropriate process meant that familiar course structures were probably no longer appropriate. Perceptions of transferable skills, the process of their acquisition, and appropriate learning situations and course structures all interrelated.[80]

In the CNAA-based study of vocationalism in undergraduate courses, a common emphasis was apparent on the interdisciplinary nature of undergraduate work in such areas as engineering, business studies and

town planning. The vocational content of courses has in fact been equated with an interdisciplinary approach. Interdisciplinary shapes have been found in recent decades for courses of many kinds — including by the new universities in the development of 'area studies' or such new programmes as environment or development studies in the 1960s. What the CNAA study of 'public sector' institutions revealed, however, was a sense of the inescapably interdisciplinary nature of their vocational approach, and widespread and explicit attempts to find appropriate strategies for bringing together the elements of courses which, particularly in business studies, were abandoning or decreasing discipline-based approaches.[81] In that connection the project, the case study, the group activity, the sandwich component of many courses, the problem-centred or issue-centred approach, were receiving increased attention.

In further education, without the same commitment, for instance in national and higher national courses, there has nevertheless in some schemes been a parallel emphasis on integration and coherence. The examining bodies have traditionally sought, especially in those courses with clear academic intentions, to achieve a coherent approach to the studies planned, but with the interest in modular structures that became focal in BEC and TEC and then in BTEC the terms of the discussion changed. In British higher education there is an unresolved, and possibly inevitable, tension between approaches to structure based on progression through relatively planned sequences and approaches through access to more open structures, often involving modules and units. The growing emphasis on this latter approach in national and higher national courses brought into greater prominence questions of modular range and possibilities of integration and coherence.

In the 1970s BEC produced clear thematic underpinning for its courses, and in the early 1980s moved away from subject organization to modular organization. At BEC general level the move was to a core plus optional modules, and at national level to a common core of four modules, plus options. The BEC emphasis on thematic, interdisciplinary learning now had to face the difficulties of a unitized structure within which it was possible for broad aims to disappear into packages which it was difficult to relate.[82] BTEC further emphasized the interdisciplinary, or more specifically 'cross-disciplinary', nature of its courses, at the same time as pursuing the model of core-modules-plus-options. It kept alive the notion of the integration of studies through a combination of core units, common skills and core themes. 'Integrative' became a key vocabulary — though BTEC was aware of the difficulties involved.[83]

The process of modularization was evident in the structures developed for the CPVE and elsewhere — particularly in the Scottish Action

Plan, based entirely on a detailed catalogue of approaching 2,000 modules — a model which the RVQ found attractive in thinking about a modular, credit-accumulation structure for a National Vocational Qualification.[84] In all such cases there was emphasis on the desirability or importance of interdisciplinary elements in the structure. BTEC stressed a variety of integrative possibilities, particularly the importance of course teams and projects, and the Scottish Action Plan included 'integrative modules'.[85] There were, nonetheless, cries of 'chaos' and the failure of 'integrative modules' to integrate.[86]

One difficulty experienced in these structural developments has been lack of familiarity in British further education with the behavioural objectives often associated with modular structures, or with the various kinds of outcomes measurement. BEC and TEC, and particularly the latter, brought behavioural objectives centrally into programme planning. BEC's general modules were setting a pattern in the emphasis on performance aims. The specification for a module on communication and human relations in 1977 typically read:

> Aim: To improve systematically the student's language and social skills as a basis both for his/her coursework as a whole and for the development of the ability to function effectively as an individual and an employee.[87]

TEC, in the late 1970s, was specifying aims for its programmes in general and for individual courses. The one for general engineering, for example, aimed to enable the student to:

> acquire the knowledge and intellectual skills that are appropriate to the technician...
>
> use and communicate information...
>
> acquire an understanding of the processing of materials...
>
> develop high level intellectual skills through the development of analytical concepts and cross-disciplinary knowledge of theory and techniques and their application to the work situation;
>
> acquire the qualities needed to complement the professional engineering in his role of innovator and/or controller;
>
> work effectively with others...

The programme 'would be expected to stimulate the personal development of the student'.[88] The most vivid example of the new behavioural basis was in TEC units being offered in 1983, at the time when BTEC was created and taking over TEC courses: the civil engineering units, for

instance, contain detailed objectives which are in all cases prefaced by the following words:

> All the objectives should be understood to be prefixed by the words: the expected learning outcome is that the student. . . .[89]

One of the problems with modules based on a learning outcomes model of this kind was that it emphasized a discrete, self-contained approach to the modules. The greater cohesiveness across college departments proposed by, among others, the FEU (in its consideration of the CPVE in 1986),[90] was not an easy target to achieve, and departmental structures or 'cultures' militated gainst interdisciplinary aims.[91] Unit-based BTEC programmes have been felt to be inflexible, and the greater coherence of the older system has been felt to be sacrificed to a new trend — for which there are other kinds of justification based on student choice and access. The basic question raised by these difficulties was whether the aims of coherence, integration and interdisciplinary understanding remained serous aims, and capable of implementation.

If one aspect of the vocational in further education is the harnessing of multiple disciplinary or thematic inputs to a central task relating to employment, it is pertinent to look at strategies like BTEC 'cross-modular assignments' and course teams, and ask to what extent they are able to serve the purposes intended for them.

Problem-solving techniques, for example, have been heavily emphasized by examining bodies and by staff involved in implementing programmes. An annex to the Labour government's *A Better Start in Working Life* in 1979 looked at 'the content of vocational preparation' and included 'specific problem-solving techniques', games and simulations as ways of 'consolidating experience'. It included project work in the same category,[92] and as in the CNAA study of higher education it is clear that in further education considerable importance is attached to project work, in the final stages of national certificate and diploma courses, for example — partly to induct or shock students into independent forms of investigation and analysis, partly to bring them into touch with industry-generated or other 'real world' problems, partly in order to serve as interdisciplinary strategy.

At all levels of this discussion, therefore, the structure of courses is intended to serve the declared vocational purposes, but has the ability to work against them. Reconciling the relative 'inflexibilities' of courses, administrative rigidities of institutions, possibilities of 'real world' connections, and needs of students for focus and understanding, has been difficult for those who plan and teach the courses, given not only the pressures of change in the job market but also the resistance of various kinds. There is, as we have said, no necessary connection between the 'vocation-

alism' of a scheme or programme and its structure, but the purpose and meaning in reality of vocationalism may be seriously influenced by the structure. If there are balances of *content* to be considered in this discussion, there are equally questions of 'balance of *structure*'.

Vocationalism and Work

An important element in pursuing the meaning of the vocational is the fact that its complexity and elusiveness are matched by the complexity and elusiveness of those educational concepts often posed as its opposites — the liberal, the general, the non-vocational. Antitheses based on such distinctions are extremely difficult to pin down — the threads drawn together in this discussion suggest that clear-cut distinctions are either impossible or misleading.

One of the most persistent of these distinctions is what Clive Booth in 1979 called 'the traditional and increasingly groundless separation between *education* and *training*'[93] — a separation which often suggests that education is concerned with living, and training with doing. Training is interpreted as skill — or information-oriented, education as an engagement with enquiry, about the environment, about human and social process, about the self. The role of the MSC has sharpened the questions about education and training, but the answers have not necessarily been less ambiguous. Many of the MSC's own definitions of its purposes have emphasized the priority of training, but in terminologies which bring training and its components close what is sometimes accepted as 'education'. It described the YOP experience in 1981 as helping young people to 'develop in maturity, confidence and independence, and to acquire experience of work and a range of basic skills which, taken together, lay a foundation for adult life'.[94] Some might ask how far that differs from what education as a whole expects to do. The emphasis on personal qualities, however strong the overall concern with skills and preparation for work, whittles away some of the boundary of what has been commonly accepted as vocational. The MSC was not unaware of this, and there were attempts to define as well as emphasize the distinction between education and training. The Director of Training at the MSC Training Services Agency presented training as 'helping people to perform, enabling them to achieve... Training is thus concerned with the very essence of living life to the full. We must learn to read and write, to get on with people, to do the shopping and to earn a living'. Training therefore had to do with identifying abilities and helping to develop them: 'step by step our abilities should progress until we have reached our first goal'. Training often failed to give proper consideration to 'what needs to be learnt, in what sequence,

in what manner and to what end'. Such a concern with sequence and progress, however, had to encompass more than help for *individuals* 'to acquire the attitude, knowledge and skills needed to perform tasks or jobs'. It now had to be concerned with groups of people working in teams 'to perform more complex sets of tasks'.

Having established these criteria of training, however, Ron Johnson went on to recognize that there was no 'hard and fast borderline between education and training', but that there were differences in emphasis:

> at one extreme there are elements of education that can hardly be said to be concerned with helping people to perform anything useful. At the other end of the spectrum there are pieces of training narrowly designed to enable individuals to perform dull repetitive tasks which are highly specific...

His overall conclusion was that 'there is a worthwhile distinction between the two cultures and aims and that it is worth recognizing this and seeking to find in each situation the optimal balance'.[95] Differentiating between the two 'cultures' and balancing them has been a difficult twentieth-century exercise. A decade after Johnson's analysis Christopher Patten, Minister of State at the DES, attempted to locate the work of the MSC in a discussion of education and training:

> All our young people in vocational programmes should receive not only training to do a more or less clearly defined range of jobs and the education directly relevant to those jobs, but also a broader education... I am not going back on my ... comments about the unnecessary polarization of discussions about education and training. In many cases in our system the words are useful but dangerous shorthand for, on the one hand, that which is provided by employers or MSC and, on the other hand, that which is provided by the formal educational system.

The MSC had 'a liberal track record in most areas of its activity' but it was not 'in business to provide a liberal, across-the-board educational experience'.[96]

In further education, perhaps even more than in other sectors of the educational system, the difficulties of drawing a line between two such conceptual compartments have been both considerable and underestimated. The organizations involved in further education have consistently denied the validity of firm boundaries, and have tried to minimize them — at least in policy terms. Attempts to straddle such traditional boundaries are visible in the way the Royal Society of Arts, for example, has seen its role, particularly in relation to the further distinction between the

vocational and the academic. In 1984–85 it was describing its schemes as embracing both. In its responses to the RVQ in 1986 it constantly underlined its concern about the separation at 14 into 'academic' and 'vocational' curricula, as expressed in the emergent separate routes of GCSE and the qualifications being considered by the RVQ — which could lead to 'greater polarization' between them. Distinctions between the 'so-called academic' and the 'so-called vocational' were 'artificial', and the RSA believed that bridges could be built through emphasis on 'competence' and 'capability'.[97]

Such distinctions between high-status categories like academic and the low-status vocational have pervaded education, especially in England — and they have been institutionalized to the point that it is difficult to see them being seriously eroded. There are many such dichotomies in further education, but the one that has been most troublesome in the past thirty or so years has been that between the vocational and the two virtually interchangeable concepts of the liberal and the general. From the second half of the 1950s the distinction was reflected organizationally in liberal or general studies courses and departments, and the considerable attention given by all the examining and validating bodies and the colleges to the relationship between general and vocational studies.

General studies in further education has throughout been an unclear and controversial concept, and developed amid anxieties about technical narrowness and inadequacy as the colleges grew in the post-war years.[98] Courses were often being constructed around relatively low-level technical content, and such content did not seem enough. There was scope and, it appeared, need for other things — general education — to be added.[99] The forms adopted for the new general or liberal elements from the late 1950s, at all levels of technical education from craft to Diploma in Technology under the NCTA and then as 'complementary and contrasting' studies in the early days of the CNAA, have been widely chronicled,[100] but at this point it is important to consider the implications of developments particularly in 1955–57.

Published in 1955, *Liberal Education in a Technical Age* was a book based on the work of a committee under various auspices, including the National Institute of Adult Education. The 'liberal studies' movement was in part an outcome of the thinking that went into this report. The 1956 White Paper on technical education argued that it must not be 'too narrowly vocational'. Circular 323 from the Ministry of Education in 1957 proposed the inclusion of a 'liberal element' in technical courses. One option — the one that proved most influential — was the incorporation of 'additional subjects' into technical courses. The NCTA was created in 1956, and its DipTech award required that the courses include liberal

studies. *Liberal Education in a Technical Age* and Circular 323 became the foundation documents of liberal or general studies in technical colleges[101].

Liberal Education argued for liberal attitudes and values, the extension of narrow technical studies towards their social, historical and human implications. It found that existing generous interpretations of technical studies were only so in principle: the practice, under the pressure of examinations and employers' expectations, was otherwise. The Committee's view was that general studies were necessary, and to have a suitable status within the college they must be embodied in a separate department[102]. Although there were arguments here and in 323 for more 'liberal' *technical* studies (what 323 called 'broadening the treatment of technical and scientific subjects'), the clearest direction and easiest option was the liberal or general studies add-on ('the inclusion of additional subjects', in the words of 323).

What the book and the Circular failed to address was the nature and future of technical, further, technological, vocational, studies. Both ignored the central problems of the 'technical age', its characteristics and values, and pointed technical education towards deepening distinctions. Technical educators themselves were absolved from confronting the weaknesses and strengths of their courses. The problem of a technical or technological culture was relegated to liberal studies lecturers who in the main knew and cared little about technology and a technical age and were committed to course contents of which only a limited number were concerned with the working lives of the students. Generally speaking, the very breadth of the liberal studies opportunities was interpreted as excluding those subjects which came too close to identification with the technical, the industrial, the commercial. The divide between the technical/vocational and the liberal/general was probably widened rather than bridged by the liberal studies enthusiasm generated in the late 1950s.

The policies of the examining and providing bodies that were subsequently debated and carried into effect were not easily and uniformly arrived at. In the early 1970s, for example, TEC adopted a principle of required studies which complemented the technical and vocational content of students' programmes, studies which became translated as general and communication studies components amounting to 15 per cent of the whole. BEC on the other hand adopted no such position, pursuing instead strategies related to and integrated with the central purposes defined for BEC awards.

Liberal studies changed under pressures towards models based on communication and personal skills. Communication studies often moved into the core of new programmes. Technical studies departments often

related differently to staff who worked closely with them in directing students towards information retrieval or project report writing. Liberal studies staff were being advised to be 'nicer to engineers'.[103] In these contexts vocational courses, whatever their strengths or weaknesses, were not presented as requiring a liberal or general 'antidote'.[104] Pressure was on the designers of vocational preparation programmes to think through the purpose and nature of the cores and options, the central direction and contingent needs. In terms of course intentions this meant attention to what is meant by the range of skills and competences we have considered, and the definition of course aims in vocabularies which have become commonplace — understanding, appreciation, insights, evaluation...

The intentions in displacing liberal studies and moving in new directions were often confused, sometimes narrow, but an important outcome was that they helped to open up the black box of vocational education to more explicit scrutiny and discussion. Against the difficult backgrounds of change in employment and the rise of mass unemployment the formulations could have gone in less 'integrative' directions in the late 1970s and 1980s, and the momentum may well have been dissipated by the realities of scheme planning and implementation. A Labour government consultative paper on the education and training of 16–18-year-olds, in 1979, encapsulated the intentions we have surveyed. It pointed to the 'shortcomings' of definitions which distinguish 'training' to perform specific vocational tasks from 'education' as the general development of knowledge, moral values and understanding. 'Vocational preparation' treated 'the entire process of learning'.[105] This emphasis represents in the conditions of the late 1970s the same search for an escape from the 'shortcomings' of established distinctions and definitions as was represented by the Ministry's search for an escape from artificial divisions in the 1940s.

The many overlapping and elusive categories involved in such discussion are neither new nor uniquely British. In the early debates about vocational education — often intense and acrimonious — in the United States around the turn of this century, the aspects of training, education and other distinctions to which we have referred aroused considerable interest. A number of contributors to a national conference held in 1914 examined the 'real distinction' between the liberal and vocational, the specific and the general, training for production, for work and for leisure. Contributors stressed in some cases the essential role of the vocational in training people to be producers, and of a liberal education to prepare good 'utilizers'. This produced the denial that there was any sharp distinction between man as producer and man as consumer. A paper on 'Harmonizing vocational and cultural education' argued that 'vocational education is not in conflict with liberal education, but is a supplement to it, and may be

expected to reinforce it'. The vocational was cultural because it provided 'a purpose early in life. This purpose has an organizing, systematizing power over the mind'.[106]

These arguments, in different conditions and with different terminologies, have continued in Britain and the United States. An interesting reflection on the terminologies and the range of interpretations that have been placed on the vocational is provoked by a contribution to the same 1914 conference on the precise topic of 'Vocational education — its terminology'. This lists all the types of the vocational detected by the author — including (and the following is only a partial list): manual training, industrial education, vocational education, professional vocational education, commercial vocational education, trade education, occupational education, pre-vocational education, vocational continuing education. . . .[107] Without the same tortuous catalogue, vocational education and training has continued to be the subject of efforts to define and interpret. Definitions and terminologies of these kinds are penetrable not by rhetorical ideologies but by considerations of how they relate to what becomes visible or concealed in the process of formulating and delivering courses of study.

The recent history of the context and design of schemes and courses suggests a tendency for old dichotomies to appear in new guises, and for the intention or the rhetoric of breadth or generous interpretation to move into narrower channels. The causes may lie in the pressures of immediate manpower or workplace requirements, in the resistance of providers to forms of implementation, or in the conservatism of the professional and organizational structures within which the courses are offered. The causes also lie in the failures of industry and other areas of employment to respond to pressures and needs for training. British industrial culture has narrowly interpreted both the opportunities and the responsibilities, and one way of writing the history of British technical and vocational education in the twentieth century is with reference to the constant re-emergence of old attitudes in new situations. Educational structures and professional organization and practice have had no monopoly of conservatism. Only signals of economic disaster forced the partners in the vocational exercise to begin to rethink their roles. If one Victorian legacy has been anti-industrialism, another has been versions of industrial 'anti-educationalism' — both stronger in Britain than in most other advanced countries.

Within these and other constraints the search for an effective and defensible vocationalism focusses on relevance and detailed and elusive definitions and typologies of skill and competence. Typologies of skill have become so extended and complex that to pin an interpretation of the vocational entirely on a simple conception of skills as a preparation for work is merely to transfer the ambiguity of 'vocational' to the ambiguity of 'skill'.

The same point is reached in the discussion of a frontier between the vocational and 'education' or other alternatives. The frontier becomes so indistinct that it is not clear whether the vocational becomes subsumed in the educational or vice-versa. Attempts to bridge the concepts are obviously important but not all the attempts buttress the intentions. As we have seen, 'liberal' or 'general' studies may strengthen a dichotomy. Integrative modules may fail to overcome disaggregated structures. Team design and teaching may be prevented from implementing cross-disciplinary goals by the strength of disciplines and the administrative units in which they are enshrined.

In terms of *intention*, however, attempts to define — in general or operational terms — such concepts as 'vocational preparation' for those students not previously obtaining access to 'academic' or 'traditional vocational/technical' provision[108] have pointed in fruitful directions, if only by challenging conventional assumptions about the categories commonly applied to such provision. The 'new' vocationalism of the 1970s and 1980s has, if nothing else, put a range of commonly held assumptions under the microscope.

It is important again to emphasize that in analyzing policy, intentions must not be confused with the problems of implementation, though it has been essential to consider how the vocational has been interpreted in various processes. Critiques of the new vocationalism have often been concerned with both intention and implementation — for example in relation to arguments concerning social control, deskilling, the legitimation of the existing social order, overt or covert racism, or sexist assumptions in provision for girls. In this chapter we have been less concerned with practice than with the implicit or explicit aims which are prior to practice, but which are obviously then shaped by it. Those aims and definitions have a context in the world of employment and unemployment, politics and economics, but the focus here has been not on the grand design but on the middle ground of the intentions of the policy-makers and providers. The assumption in so doing has been that the essential characteristics of the vocational in post-secondary education have to do with designing courses which serve the needs of the student and of the employment market, of the student in relation to work and leisure, the student as producer and 'utilizer', as citizen and employee. We have not taken account directly of what courses assume about student constituencies, their expectations and responses, and the processes by which these in turn influence course aims. The literature of further education abounds in analyses of who the students are, what their needs are, how they learn, who fails and why. The constituencies are enormously diverse, and curricula have in the past been grounded in assumptions about the apprentice, the young school leaver — with the obvious exception of those

courses provided in professional or semi-professional contexts for mainly part-time students.

Just as post-secondary provision has had to respond to the pressures arising from debate about race and gender, so has it also had to reexamine its assumptions about the age distribution of its clienteles. The sharpest example has been the FEU's revision of its 1981 *Vocational Preparation* to take account of the needs of continuing education. *Relevance, Flexibility and Competence* redefined vocational preparation in generic terms appropriate to all ages, proclaimed it to be an entitlement from age 14, directed greater attention to issues of race and gender and progression, and underlined the importance and implications of the key concepts of its title.[109] Pinning down the vocational in its relationship to preparation for employment will increasingly have to find reference points in re-employment and new patterns of employment.

At the same time the vocational is not directed towards a stable constituency of 'adolescents'. It is not possible here to consider in depth the implications of the concept of adolescence for the issues we are discussing, but it is useful broadly to suggest its importance. In this century (adolescence has been discovered as a 'problem' period only since the beginning of this century) it has been analyzed as a period in which conflict — in Western societies — occurs as the child moves away from a situation of dependence. When and in what forms that conflict occurs has been shaped to a considerable degree by changes in juvenile employment, in family and social values, in the factors which affect puberty, in many aspects of educational and social systems. Adolescence has increasingly been broken down into stages — themselves unstable conceptually — and it has become realized how much the early assumptions about adolescence were predicated on approaches to the psychology and sociology of the male.[110] The concept of adolescence has in practical terms related to voting age and a variety of social phenomena, including apprenticeship and work. In early industrial Britain the child entering employment rapidly acquired adult characteristics (very often as a major contributor to the family economy), and in contemporary society 'having a job means being an adult',[111] although with a continuing conflict between the 'adult' world of work and the 'adolescent' peer-group social and cultural identity that preceded and overlaps with it.

The most obvious changes that have taken place in recent years have related to unemployment. Just as technical changes in the late nineteenth century led to a postponement of entry into employment and a lengthening of social life, so unemployment, especially in the 1980s created an increasing 'moratorium before adulthood',[112] if adulthood is equated with work. Employment was being postponed for substantial numbers of school leavers, the proportion going into employment directly from school at 16

slumped dramatically, and young people's expectations of the worlds of work and of adulthood were inevitably modified. White the education-training sequences changed, the process of maturation has not in any way been slowed, young people mature several years before they are released from dependency (sometimes with little expectation of release) and there is a rapidly disappearing boundary between adolescence and early adulthood — with both undergoing reinterpretation.[113]

In technological societies subject to unemployment and fluctuations in employment, planning for vocational ends is faced with having to respond not only to those fluctuations but also to changes in the sources and nature of student motivation. This has been true of the YTS unemployed and of the national student uncertain about the future of employment in particular areas. It has been true when the automobile industry declined in Detroit or dockyards closed in Chatham. If there are changes in student needs and perceptions of their position with regard to employment, this must inevitably reflect back on to the framework within which vocational intentions are translated into courses. These changes must inevitably also have repercussions for the work of the vocational teacher, among other factors which influence the implementation of course aims. One of the weaknesses pinpointed in the 'liberal studies' movement was its diversion of attention from the consideration of course content and teaching methods in the technical and vocational areas. Much has happened in the field of teacher preparation and development in further education in the past decade, but other pressures have still prevented staff development and curriculum development from basically confronting the meaning and implications of a 'liberal technical' or 'liberal vocational' provision for the teaching process. Further education teaching has had its critics. Further education teachers have been described as 'under-educated', 'narrow' or having a 'narrow repertoire of teaching methods'.[114] We have suggested how imprisoned staff may be (in further education as at other levels of education) in their disciplinary and organizational boundaries, and the greater collaboration demanded of them by BEC and other subsequent programmes has not been easy to achieve.[115]

In locating contemporary meanings for post-secondary vocational provision it is clear that the questions asked include in a central place how vocational 'training' or 'preparation' is different from, but also the same as, any other form of education. If the distinction between 'narrow' training and 'broad' education is abandoned as a basis on which to build an understanding, the essential question becomes how possible it is to make training itself an education, the technical itself liberal. Pressures to prevent the vocational from meeting broad criteria are strong — pressures from zealous policy-makers for immediate goals; from students with urgent conceptions of what constitutes relevance; from staff caught between the

challenges of the vocational and other academic or professional imperatives. The cumulative impact of those pressures may be the possibility of an unthinking, unreflective utilitarianism. The vocational is, and needs to be associated with utilitarian, functional intentions, but those intentions also need to be part of a larger configuration, which is responsive to more than a simplistic view of what constitutes a skill or an occupational requirement. Approaching vocationalism with course processes as the primary focus is an important way of identifying the directions in which to go to develop appropriate contents and structures.

Central to this approach to vocationalism is the curriculum process and its interpretation as something other than collections of 'subjects' to be distributed. The message of the discussions of skills and competence has been that collection versions of narrowly conceived skills or parcelled-off topics do not point to defensible forms of preparation for either personal or employment flexibility. The message is important at school level also. Any future for a common curriculum, for example, can only lie in broadly interpreted, developmental approaches to what constitutes a 'common core'. The FEU in this respect translated its approach to the content of further education curricula into recommendations and warnings at an early stage of discussion about a national school curriculum. It expressed the view that a core which consisted of 'discrete single subjects' would be unsuitable, whereas one based on 'aims, processes and outcomes' leaves open the possibility of local decision as to appropriate delivery methods. In addition, as it had previously pointed out, 'an over emphasis on performance outcomes and their testing in training can undermine the quality of learning. This danger would equally apply to the secondary curriculum'.[116] Broad interpretations in vocational preparation have signals for other levels of the system.

The vocational, approached through courses, does not end with courses; it reaches out into the world of the student and the teaching processes, in ways which we have briefly indicated. It reaches out into the world of work, a world which is not separate from the student or the employee, but which contains both. Our awareness of the world of work is governed by a host of images which come, at one end of a spectrum, from central policy interpretation and formulation, through the whole range of media and real life impressions, to people's own experience of work, in the form of jobs and other forms. In recent years work has come to be talked of publicly mainly in 'market' terms, with the constant policy attempt to match training with the market — an attempt which has persistently broken down because of the speed of change, changing patterns of employment, and unstable national and international demand.[117] Attempts to bring 'work' into the secondary school face the problem of anticipating experience more than is the case in further education, where for

most students, whether or not in employment, work has begun to be translated into experimentation with the job market. Entry to, and sustained performance in, the market is the prime motivation of the student, and the strength of that motivation in the case of students in higher education has also not been sufficiently appreciated.[118] The difficulty in establishing a defensible interpretation of the vocational in further education, however, has been that of basing curricula on a real understanding of skills — and *centrally* including personal skills — as characteristics of people, of workers and of the work they do.[119] The economic pressures of the past decade have been heavily oriented towards jobs, and amidst those pressures attempts to understand the underlying processes of effective and ineffective work, the relationships between work and adult life, and the essential components of preparation for them have, with only limited exceptions, been underemphasized or ignored.

The literature of socio-technical or 'quality of work life' analysis has had some limited impact in the United States and in Europe, but little in Britain. The essence of these approaches is that socio-technical literacy involves

> a balanced concern for the social, human aspects of work, as well as the technical aspects, and an appreciation of their interactions. It should include a better understanding of the philosophical underpinnings and consequences of the shift from a mechanistic, technological, scientific management perspective of work to a high-involvement, participative management perspective and approach to work. The broader perspective and goal of sociotechnical literacy is more consistent with major workplace innovations and requirements than a purely technological focus.[120]

Although the MSC and others located work as an integrative focus for vocational programmes, the conception of work involved has not extended to judging the effectiveness of work processes themselves, as implied by any approach to vocational flexibility. Socio-technical approaches also represent a break with a long tradition of scientific management, in favour of a 'democratic work theory' based on the precise experiences of a number of major American and European corporations, a theory which relates to the workplace but has meaning for a technological society in general.[121]

The importance is not in the detail of the theory, but in a challenge to static conceptions of work, of efficiency and of how it is to be obtained and judged. What is involved is an attempt to understand the future direction of the vocational and forms of work appropriate to the 'versatility' that will be important in coming decades. A move in this direction is the FEU's *Relevance, Flexibility and Competence*, which takes as its starting point an assumption that '*vocation* i.e. an individual's main role(s) in society sub-

sumes *occupation* i.e. that role associated with work and employment' — which carries the FEU's concern with broad vocational preparation into the wider territory of the consideration of vocation itself.[122] Jobs become vocations when they are carried out because the work and the worker share the 'balanced concerns' which are relevant to the enterprise and which go beyond the enterprise. The question is not whether there should be vocational preparation, whether the vocational is an appropriate concept for further education, whether jobs are important. Those questions are merely the base-line from which the important questions begin — what kind of preparation, with what kind of interpretation of the concepts, the practice,the implications?

Vocationalism, its meanings, effectiveness and status cannot be defended in terms of 'policy breadth' if this degenerates either into narrow implementation processes or into narrow interpretation resulting from ideological or market pressures. Vocationalism is not defensible if it rests on rigid versions of skill or simplistic versions of outcomes which translate older, inflexible notions of the vocational into new conceptions of the same. The vocational may have an emphasis but there is no gulf separating it completely from other forms of education. There are no courses which are soley vocational or solely non-vocational. A new vocationalism has been thrust by events — themselves often unwelcome — into public attention, and this has offered an opportunity to reconsider post-school provision for constituencies often ill-served in the past. It has offered an opportunity to reconsider status differences inherited from a century or more of hierarchical views of occupations, institutions, qualifications and knowledge. Vocationalism, generously interpreted in these ways, places emphasis on the combined needs of student and workplace, on the challenge to old structures and contents, and to established patterns of teaching and organization. In a proper relationship between vocational education and work — as Dewey and others have warned — *both* sides of the relationship have to be scrutinized and adapted.

What this analysis suggests is that between policy conceived in grand, overarching terms, and the minutiae of educational practice, there is a middle ground of intention and strategies that it is necessary to explore. It is a middle ground which, in terms of the changing concepts and their interpretation that are involved, can be approached with an interest in the specificities of change as familiar to the historian, and can be related back to the policy directions they represent. Policy-making is a process of declared intention and action, within which many processes are concealed or only dimly perceptible, and intention is one of the most impenetrable aspects of the realities which historians attempt to probe and to reconstruct. Course planning and design are an aspect of educational policy intentions and intended outcomes through which it is possible to enter the

policy process in education at sensitive and revealing points. Detailed concern with the educational pursuit of a concept such as 'the vocational' is one point at which a historical focus and policy analysis can usefully meet.

Notes

1 Boffey, R. (1984) 'FE and the YTS: Some thoughts on year one', *NATFHE Journal*, 9, 6, p. 23; Tolley, G., (1983) 'Questions about vocational preparation', *Coombe Lodge Report*, 16, 3, p. 117; Garrett, M. (1978) 'The Technician Education Council and curriculum development', paper No. 2/78, *Proceedings of the Standing Conference on the Sociology of Further Education*, Blagdon, Coombe Lodge, p. 3.

2 Tolley, G. (1979) 'Further education: Challenge and response', paper presented to the North of England Education Conference, p. 4.

3 FEU (1981) *Vocational Preparation*, London, FEU, p. 8.

4 Melling, G. (1981) 'The new FE — A personal view' in Youthaid (Ed.) *YOP and UVP: The New F.E. or a Tertiary Modern System?*, p. 3.

5 *ibid.*, p. 4; Tolley, G. (1979) *op cit*, p. 3.

6 National Advisory Council on Education for Industry and Commerce (1969) *Report of the Committee on Technician Courses and Examinations*, London, HMSO.

7 Cotgrove, S.F. (1958) *Technical Education and Social Change*, London, Allen & Unwin, pp. 41–2.

8 Dewey, J. (1916) 'The need of an industrial education in an industrial democracy' and (1917) 'Learning to earn: The place of vocational education in a comprehensive scheme of public education', in Boydston, J.A. (Ed.) (1980) *John Dewey: The Middle Works, 1899–1924*, vol. 10, Carbondale, IL, Southern Illinois University Press.

9 Whitehead, A.N. (1932) *The Aims of Education*, London, Williams & Norgate, (Ernest Benn edn of 1970, chapter 4).

10 Wiener, M.J. (1981) *English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit 1850–1980*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, passim.

11 For a discussion of the 'service function' of higher education see Rothblatt, S. (1983) 'The diversification of higher education in England' in Jarausch, K.H. (Ed.) *The Transformation of Higher Learning 1860–1930*, Chicago, IL, Chicago University Press.

12 Ministry of Education (1947) *Further Education*, London, HMSO; Ministry of Education (1946) *Youth's Opportunity: Further Education in County Colleges*, London, HMSO, pp. 32–3.

13 Tolley, G. (1979) *op cit*, pp. 6–7.

14 Quoted in report of speech in *Times Educational Supplement*, 13 December 1985, p. 7.

15 Minister of Education (1961) *Better Opportunities in Technical Education*, London, HMSO, pp. 5–10.

16 CGLI (1964) *Further Education for Operatives* and *Further Education for Craftsmen*, London, CGLI.

17 Ministry of Education (1949) *Report of a Special Committee on Education for Commerce*, London, HMSO, pp. 4–5 and 35.

18 Minister of Education *et al.* (1956) *Technical Education*, London, HMSO, p. 5.
19 National Advisory Council on Art Education (1962) *Vocational Courses in Colleges and Schools of Art* (second report), London, HMSO, pp. 1–3.
20 NACEIC (1969) *op cit*, p. 21.
21 Central Advisory Council for Education (England) (1959) *15 to 18*, Vol. 1, London, HMSO, pp. 391–5.
22 ENTWISTLE, H. (1970) *Education, Work and Leisure*, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, pp. 61–2 and 93.
23 MELLING, G. (1981) *op cit*, p. 2.
24 MELLING in an interview, 3 April 1987.
25 GRANT, L. (1985) 'The changing patterns of vocational education for 16–18-year-olds: A critical comment' (quoting HMI Norris), *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 9, 1, p. 61.
26 FEU (1981) *op cit*, p. 12.
27 AVIS, J. (1983) 'ABC and the new vocational consensus', *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 7, 1, pp. 25 and 28.
28 GLEESON, D. and MARDLE, G. (1980) *Further Education or Training?* London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, p. 7; MOOS, M. (1979) *Government Youth Training Policy and its Impact on Further Education*, Birmingham, Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, mimeo, pp. 29–37.
29 For one American model see HAWKINS, D. (1973) 'Liberal education: A modest polemic' in KAYSEN, C. (Ed.) *Content and Context: essays on college education*, New York, McGraw-Hill. Relevant American and European literature is discussed in WIRTH, A.G. (1987) 'Contemporary work and the quality of life' in BENNE, K. and TOZER, S. (Eds) *Society as Educator*, Chicago, IL, National Society for the Study of Education.
30 ENTWISTLE, H. (1970) *op cit*, p. 78.
31 LITTLE, A. (1986) 'Education and employment: A state-of-the-art review', *Bulletin of the International Bureau of Education*, 238/9, p. 8.
32 TOLLEY, G. (1979) *op cit*, pp. 7–8.
33 See, for example, London County Council (1947) *London School Plan*, p. 222, for the 'vocationalism' of the grammar school.
34 For Dewey see note 8 above; for Entwistle see *Education, Work and Leisure*, passim.
35 Spencer's essay on 'What knowledge is of most worth?' was included in his (1861) *Education: Intellectual, Moral and Physical*, New York, Williams & Norgate, 1861.
36 For example, BOYER, E. (1977) 'The core of learning' in VERMILYE, D.W. (Ed.) *Relating Work and Education*, San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass.
37 'Manifesto for change', in *Times Educational Supplement*, 30 January 1981, p. 18.
38 DUFFY, M. (1983) 'Colonizing the curriculum 14–16', *Times Educational Supplement*, 8 April, p. 4.
39 ATKINS, M. and BROWN, G. (1986) 'Pre-vocational courses: Some assessment issues and values', *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 10, 1; ATKINS, M.J. (1986) 'The pre-vocational curriculum: A review of the issues involved', *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 19, 1.
40 MSC (1983) *Aims of the New Technical and Vocational Education Initiative*, mimeo; HOLLAND, G. (1986) 'Training young people for the future' in RANSON, S. *et al.* (Eds) *The Revolution in Education and Training*, London, Longman.

41 CATTELL, D. (1985) 'New vocationalism — the relevance of the 1890's', *Vocational Aspect of Education*, 37, 98, pp. 89–90, quoting David Young.
42 JONES, A. (1983) 'Door need not close when Young comes in', *Times Educational Supplement*, 7 January, p. 4.
43 DAVIES, D.G.S. (1983/84) *Fulmer/Berkshire Project: Towards More Relevant Education*, Fulmer Research Institute and Royal County of Berkshire.
44 DES and Welsh Office (1984) *The Organisation and Content of the 5–16 Curriculum*, London, HMSO, mimeo, para 27.
45 MCARTHUR, J. (1985) 'CPVE: Commitment or capitulation?', *NATFHE Journal*, 10, 2, p. 15.
46 SILVER, H. and BRENNAN, J. (1988) *A Liberal Vocationalism*, London, Methuen.
47 Minister of Education *et al.* (1956) *op cit*, pp. 5 and 19.
48 KNUTTON, H. (1978) *City and Guilds — A Way Ahead*, London, CGLI, p. 2.
49 RSA, *Guide 1986–87*, p. 5.
50 WILMS, W.W. (1974) *Public and Proprietary Vocational Training: A Study of Effectiveness*, Berkeley, CA, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, p. 2.
51 BEC (1976) *First Policy Statement*, London, BEC, p. 11; BTEC (1984) *Policies and Priorities into the 1990s*, London, BTEC, p. 21.
52 Secretary of State for Employment *et al.* (1979) *A Better Start in Working Life: Vocational Preparation for Employed Young People in Great Britain*, London, DES, pp. 5–6 and 19.
53 Secretary of State for Employment *et al.* (1984) *Training for Jobs*, London, HMSO, pp. 4 and 13.
54 Secretary of State for Education and Science *et al.* (1985) *Education and Training for Young People*, London, HMSO; Secretary of State for Employment *et al.* (1986) *Working Together — Education and Training*, London, HMSO.
55 HAYES, C. *et al.* (1983) *Learning for Skill Ownership — Learning to Take it with You*, London, Institute of Manpower Studies, pp. 10–11, 13, 31–4, 40–1 and 50–1.
56 FEU (1985) *Supporting YTS*, (3rd edn) London, FEU, pp. 25–7; JOHNSON, R. (1984) *Occupational Training Families: Their Implications for FE*, London, FEU.
57 *Review of Vocational Qualifications in England and Wales: A Report by the Working Group*, MSC and DES, London, 1986, passim. Quotation is from the Chairman's Preface.
58 MANSELL, J. (1986) 'RVQ: A recognition of change', *Coombe Lodge Report*, 18, 9, p. 452.
59 GRUBB, W.N. and LAZERSON, M. (1981) 'Vocational solutions to youth problems: The persistent frustrations of the American experience', *Educational Analysis*, 3, 2, p. 96.
60 TURNER, C. *et al.* (1982) *Planning Local Education Authority Support for YOP: MSC Exemplary Projects*, Blagdon, Further Education Staff College, p. 9, Community Schemes Resources Unit (1981) *Scope for Skills: Vocational Preparation in YOP Community Projects*, Edinburgh, Community Schemes Resources Unit, mimeo, pp. 3–4; MAIZELS, J. (1970) *Adolescent Needs and the Transition from School to Work*, London, Athlone Press, p. 223; FEU (1985) *Response to the Review of Vocational Qualifications: In-*

terim Report, London, FEU, mimeo, p. 3.

61 TEC (1977a) joint policy statement on *A: Aims of Programmes Leading to the Council's Awards, B: General and Communication Studies*, London, TEC; TEC (1977b) *The Implementation of TEC Policy for General and Communication Studies in Certificate and Diploma Programmes*, London, TEC, mimeo.

62 TEC (1979a) *General Guidelines for Art and Design Studies*, London, TEC, preface; TEC (1979b) *Guidelines for Higher Certificate and Higher Diploma Programmes in General Engineering*, London, TEC, p. 8.

63 MELLING, G. (1978) *Report of a Visit to Canada to Investigate Research into Generic Skills*, London, mimeo; MELLING, G. (1981) *op cit*, p. 5; MSC (1981) *Vocational Preparation: A Possible Programme for Action — An MSC View*, Sheffield, MSC, mimeo, Annexe, pp. 2–3.

64 YTS (n.d.) *Core Skills in YTS*, Part 1, pp. 4–6.

65 BECKER, R.J. (1982) 'Education and Work: A historical perspective' in SILBERMAN, H.F. (Ed.) *Education and Work*, Chicago, IL, National Society for the Study of Education, pp. 4–5 and 13.

66 FEU, (1981) *op cit*.

67 FEU (1982) *Basic Skills*, p. 82; EDWARDS, T. (1984) *The Youth Training Scheme: A New Curriculum? Episode 1*, Lewes, Falmer Press, p. 69.

68 FEU (1982) *A Common Core of Skills for Vocational Preparation*, London, FEU.

69 *City and Guilds Broadsheet*, 92, 1981, p. 7; CGLI, *365 Vocational Preparation (General): Starting a 365 Programme, December 1983 Onwards*.

70 HIGSON, P. and BALMER, J. (1983) 'The death of life skills (or life without life skills)', *Liberal Education*, 49, p. 5.

71 FEU (1979) *A Basis for Choice*, London, FEU; CGLI, *365 Vocational Preparation*, p. 4; WEEDALL, 'Vocational preparation — an education view', *Coombe Lodge Review*, 12, 7, p. 340; HAYES, *Training for Skill Ownership*, 15, pp. 29–31.

72 Joint Board for Pre-Vocational Education (1984) *The Certificate of Pre-Vocational Education: Consultative Document*, London, JPPVE and Part C (1985) *Preparatory Module Specifications*.

73 FEU (1982) *A Basis for Choice*, p. 28; *Manifesto for Change*.

74 For example, FEU (1986) *Assessment, Quality and Competence*, London, FEU; FEU (1985) *A Modern Curriculum for Office Employment*, London, FEU; FEU (1985) *Core Competences in Engineering*, London, FEU.

75 MSC (1976) *Instructional Guide to Social and Life Skills*, Sheffield, MSC, (1979 edn) pp. 4–6.

76 BLYTHE, J. (1976) 'Teaching social and life skills', *Coombe Lodge Report*, 9, 2; EBBUTT, K. (1982) 'The FEU: The first four years', *Higher Education Review*, 14, 2.

77 Garnett College (1977) *Report of the Academic Board Working Party on Some Developments in the Educational Provision for the 16–19+ Age Group (Education for the Disadvantaged)*, London, p. 6.

78 RUMBERGER, R.W. (1983) *A Conceptual Framework for Analyzing Work Skills*, Stanford, CA, Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance, Stanford University, pp. 3–7.

79 Prospect Centre (1986) *The Contribution of Competence and Capability to a Vocational Qualification*, London.

80 YTS, *Core Skills in YTS*, pp. 8–12.

81 SILVER, H. and BRENNAN, J. (1988) *op cit*.
82 SELLARS, J.E. (1976) 'The Policy of the Business Education Council', *BACIE Journal*, 30, 9; RANDALL, E. (1981) 'Curriculum development in FE colleges; The Business Education Council', *Secondary Education Journal*, 11, 1; ANDERSON, K. (1984) 'Implications of BEC philosophy', *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 8, 2.
83 For example, BTEC (1986) *Common Skills and Core Themes: General Guideline*, London, BTEC, pp. 2–4; BTEC (1985) *Review of BTEC National Awards in Business and Related Studies*, London, BTEC, pp. 17 and 20.
84 *Review of Vocational Qualifications*, pp. 25–8.
85 BTEC (1986) *op cit*, p. 3.
86 HALL, V. (1985) 'Vocational qualifications under review', *NATFHE Journal*, 10, 5, p. 45.
87 BEC (1977) *Initial Guidelines on the Implementation of Policy*, London, BEC, p. 16.
88 TEC, *Guidelines for Higher Certificate and Higher Diploma Programmes*, TEC, p. 8.
89 BTEC (1983) *Civil Engineering Studies: Guidelines and Units*, London, BTEC (containing TEC programmes).
90 FEU (1986) *CPVE 13: An Alternative Route to CPVE*, London, FEU, p. 1.
91 Turner in an interview, 3 April 1987.
92 *A Better Start in Working Life*, Annex C.
93 BOOTH C. (1979) 'Programmes for young people — A view from the DES', *Coombe Lodge Review*, 12, 7, p. 319.
94 MSC (1981) *Review of the Third Year of Special Programmes*, Sheffield, MSC, p. 3.
95 JOHNSON, R. (n.d.) 'Long-term relationships between education and training' in Jordanhill College of Education (Ed.) *Further Education, Manpower and Training* (School of Further Education, Conference Report No. 6) pp. 11–13; JOHNSON, R. (1977) *Meeting Needs — Training in Context*, London, Association of Colleges for Further and Higher Education, p. 3.
96 PATTEN, C. *Times Educational Supplement*, 1985.
97 RSA, *General Report 1984–85*, p. 3; *RSA News*, 10, 1986, p. 10; *RSA News*, 11, 1986, p. 1; RSA *Guide 1986–87*, p. 9; RSA, *Review of Vocational Qualifications — Interim Report: RSA Response*, London, 1986, mimeo; RSA, *Review of Vocational Qualifications — RSA Response*, London, 1986, mimeo.
98 DIXON, K. (1986) 'The vocational aspect of education', *Vocational Aspect of Education*, 38, 100, pp. 34–42.
99 MELLING, G. (1983) *The General Education of 16–19s: A Modern Rationale* (discussion paper for DES course N. 147, mimeo) p. 6.
100 For example, WAINWRIGHT, M. (1982) 'How and why did it happen?', *Liberal Education*, 47; CARROLL, D. (1980) 'Am I communicating? An examination of the rise of communication skills in further education', *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 4, 1; FLOWER, F.D. (1976) 'Who can prescribe a general studies policy?', *Education and Training*, 18, 4; FLOWER, F.D. (1976) 'Communications skills and general studies in CGLI courses', *Coombe Lodge Report*, 9, 10.
101 National Institute of Adult Education (1955) *Liberal Education in a Technical Age*, London, Parrish; Minister of Education *et al*. (1956) *Technical Education*, London, HMSO; Ministry of Education (1957) *Liberal Educa-*

tion in Technical Colleges, London, HMSO.

102 NIAE (1955) *op cit*.

103 WADDLETON, J. (1985) 'Policies, priorities and core competences', *Liberal Education*, 52, p. 6.

104 CARROLL, D. (1980) *op cit*, p. 27.

105 Secretary of State for Education and Science *et al.* (1979) *Education and Training for 16–18 Year Olds: A Consultative Paper*, London, HMSO, p. 10.

106 SNEDDEN, D. (1914) 'Fundamental distinctions between liberal and vocational education, I', National Education Association, *Journal of Proceedings and Addresses*, Washington, DC, NEA, pp. 150–7; BAGLEY, 'Fundamental distinctions between liberal and vocational education, II', in *ibid.*, pp. 167–9; PRESTON, J.C. 'Harmonizing vocational and cultural education' in *ibid.*, p. 377. See in the same volume contributions by Seerley, Luckey, Crabtree and Cook.

107 PEARSE, C.G. 'Vocational Education — its terminology', in *ibid.* pp. 582–6.

108 FEU, (1981) *op cit*.

109 FEU, (1987) *Relevance, Flexibility and Competence*, London, FEU.

110 COLEMAN, J.C. (1979) 'Current views of the adolescent process' in COLEMAN, J.C. (Ed.) *The School Years*, London Methuen; BETTELHEIM, B. (1962) 'The problem of generations', *Daedalus*, 91, 1, p. 68.

111 GASKELL, J. and LAZERSON, M. (1980–81) 'Between school and work: Perspectives of working class youth', *Interchange*, 11, 3.

112 GRUBB, W.N. and LAZERSON, M. (1982) 'Education and the labor market: Recycling the youth problem' in KANTOR, H. and TYACK, D.B. (Eds) *Work, Youth and Schooling*, Stanford, CA, Stanford University Press, pp. 113 and 127.

113 KENISTON, K. (1960) *Youth and Dissent: The Rise of a New Opposition*, New York, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, (1971 edn); PRING, R. (1986) 'Curriculum for ages 14–16: "The new vocationalism"?', *Melbourne Studies in Education*.

114 ROBINSON, E.E. (1977) 'The relationship between general education and vocational education' in PECK, B.T. (Ed.) *European Perspectives on the Education of 16 to 19 Year Olds*, Glasgow, Jordanhill College of Education, p. 40, CARROLL, D. (1980) *op cit*, p. 28.

115 CANTOR, L.M. and ROBERTS, I.F. (1979) *Further Education Today: A Critical Review*, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, p. 77.

116 FEU (1987) *A National School Curriculum — An FEU View*, London, mimeo, paras 10–13.

117 GRUBB, W.N. (1982) *The Gifts of Vulcan, the Despair of Youth: Advanced Technology, Education, and Youth Unemployment*, Austin, TX, mimeo.

118 SILVER, H. (1983) *Education as History*, London, Methuen, chapter 8.

119 RUMBERGER, R.W. (1983) *op cit*, pp. 3–4.

120 PRATZNER, F.C. and RUSSELL, J.F. (1984) *The Changing Workplace: Implications of Quality of Work Life and Vocational Education*, Columbus, OH, National Center for Research in Vocational Education, Columbus, p. 22.

121 WIRTH, A.G. (1987) *op cit*.

122 FEU (1987) *op cit*, p. 1.

Chapter 7

Britain's Educational Worlds

We have seen ways in which an educational system and some of its component parts may be subjected to the pressures which induce or prevent change in policy and practice. Increasingly, of course, in the late twentieth century, those pressures include the operation of the 'global economy', the nature of international relations, and models of educational practice in other countries that are or appear to be 'successful', as measured largely in terms of economic effectiveness. Policy-making in recent decades has therefore involved an international process of getting to know, selecting policy-usable data, making comparisons, listening to the outcomes of international conferences and research, making relative judgments — sometimes at important, more often at trivial levels. None of these processes is new, but the particular impacts on educational processes of international traffic in ideas, images, information, personnel and materials, have assumed different proportions and acuity in the conditions of the late twentieth century.

The history of Britain's international educational relations has been explored in various ways, with regard to Britain's role as giver and receiver, outstandingly the role of education in Britain's imperial past. An outline of the total picture, however, offers some insight into how educational messages are received and decoded, selected, modified or rejected. With a particular emphasis on Britain's educational relations with what are now largely advanced industrial countries, it is such an outline that is attempted here.

'Britain' and 'Education'

Disentangling 'Britain' and 'British' from their component parts and related vocabularies — United Kingdom, Scots, English, Welsh and Irish is a contemporary and historical problem. The focus here is both Britain and

its component parts, and the complex historical connection between Britain and the rest of the world. 'Britain' marked the map of the world red, but educational relations were often more specific: Ryerson's Canada used Irish textbooks; some early colonial universities pursued a Scottish curriculum; many Australian educators transposed an English culture; nascent universities in Africa in the twentieth century were London colleges. The level of commitment to education exported by 'Britain' was often shaped specifically by the cultural aspirations of Wales or Scotland.

Britain's international educational relations have been shaped by profound changes in political and economic relationships. Britain's educational relations are of three, or perhaps more accurately four, kinds: those with Europe; those with the most developed of its former colonies — the United States; and those with what became the Commonwealth — divisible roughly into the developed, and the underdeveloped or developing countries. What Britain has given or taken over time has been governed by the nature of those relationships. Within these historical contexts the educational traffic has been varied and at many levels. Britain's medieval universities were part of an emergent European pattern and network. The history of colonization and Empire involves the implantation of schools, the export of scholars, the educational implications of mission and church, the maintenance and adaptation of cultural norms. With the internationalization of educational professions and sub-professions, agencies and campaigns, Britain received ideas from the United States, France or Scandinavia, and traded models of schooling and learning and educational analysis and policy with Europe, North America, the Commonwealth and the rest of the world.

While there are complex questions about 'Britain' and the historical and geographical contexts in which to analyze Britain's educational relationships, there are also the complexities of 'education' itself. Britain's educational trade has been in institutions and people and ideas, in social structures and cultural identities. In formal institutional terms British concepts of, for example, the 'public school' and headmaster were widely exported. In less formal terms, so also were concomitant models of gentlemanly or ladylike behaviour, non-conformist emphases on the role of chapel and its organizations and standards of action, radical working-class views of the roles of trade unions or the press, ideals of communitarian or co-operative social structures, and a range of other institutional and non-institutional activities which were transformed in other countries into educational energies of various kinds. In many cases these were the basis of imposed colonial patterns, were accepted, tolerated, transmuted, or rejected. What Britain exported to its colonies — for example in Africa and India — has in recent years been subjected to extensive historical analysis, and the educational relationship with its 'third world' empire has

been researched in increasing detail, and with increasing attention to the ideological problems of interpretation.[1] The discussion here is possibly the less well-established pattern of Britain's two-way or multi-path educational relationship with other 'worlds' — European and international. Our concern is not with the various levels of 'influence'[2] but with the state of knowledge regarding Britain's process of educational exchange. In the cases under consideration Britain has given and taken, and Britain itself has received, adapted and resisted — for example, American models of higher education, European versions of infant education, internationally varied processes concerning children with handicaps, the American or Swedish variants of the common school, and ideas and ideals of pre-school or compensatory education.

The whole of this international traffic has been periodically busy, always complex.

An Educational Revolution: 1780–1850

The medieval European scholarship of which Britain formed a part gave way to emergent nationalisms. The travelling scholars of Paris and Bologna, Oxford and Cambridge, were followed by the Renaissance scholars and educationists, whose impact and networks remained European — including Erasmus in the early sixteenth century or Comenius in the seventeenth. Ideas and people moved in and out of Britain, given the international dimensions of the church, publications, the Grand Tour. National movements, of ideas and of action, had increasingly international implications, including for education. The European Enlightenment, opening up new horizons of knowledge and public policy, focussed sharply on education, and the ideas of Locke, the Scottish rationalists, d'Holbach, Helvétius, Bentham, moved backwards and forwards and interrelated across the English Channel and the North Sea. The political revolutions of the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries carried educational messages in all directions, through Godwin or Paine from England, from Rousseau or Pestalozzi to England. Educational radicalism interlocked with political radicalism and industrial change across frontiers.[3]

The period of major educational change in Britain coincided with, and was closely related to, this period of industrial and political change. England was the recipient of experience and energies and models from Wales and Scotland — particularly the popular education, teacher training and secular university of the latter. From Europe Britain was in general receptive to the ideals and ideas of a Rousseau or the institutional practices of a Pestalozzi or de Fellenberg. Waves of impact created a movement of English Rousseauites, new teaching methods related to Pestaloz-

zian object lessons, an eagerness to experiment. From Britain emanated the monitorial system, a system of cheap instruction adaptable not only to mass schooling (and in this respect was one of the most innovative contributions Britain made to nineteenth-century education) but also to other levels of educational provision.[4]

The European educational relationships in which Britain was engaged operated in a variety of ways and at different levels. The personal networks were considerable — as Robert Owen, the Pestalozzians, the Rousseauites, the radicals, travelled to and fro. Kay-Shuttleworth found a model for his pauper education in Holland.[5] Schools arising from these various contacts, with the progressive teachers of Switzerland, were established in Ireland and England.[6] The educational texts of a Pestalozzi or an Helvétius were translated, correspondence was published. Possibilities, utopias, millennia, ideals, were picked up and turned into educational programmes.

The relationship with America was different, but with many of the same elements. The main difference was, of course, emigration from Britain and the educational impact in the context of colonization. What Britain exported in this context was not uniform: different religious and educational traditions were carried across the Atlantic, but the emigrants invariably included in their baggage a commitment to the educational basis of their versions of a new life. They planted 'schools on hills' in North America in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries,[7] and provided both Canada and the United States with the problem of what to retain, to adapt and to reject of the British (and wider European) legacies. How literacy in the United States related to the nature of immigration and the purposes and content of education has been a constant theme in American social and educational history, and a focus of increasing controversy.[8]

By the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries the United States was engaged in a two-way traffic with Britain not unlike that of Europe. Jefferson's University of Virginia was both the direct model for London University, and the recipient of British scholars.[9] American revolutionary ideals were as familiar to British radical educationists as were those of the French revolution. The United States took energetically to the Lancasterian model of the monitorial school, and the system became a basis not only for mass urban schooling, but also for the education of the American Indian.[10] Robert Owen's infant school, together with other European models, became part of American communitarian experience, and the further development of the infant school under the impetus of Samuel Wilderspin had repercussions for the development of infant schooling in the United States — as well as in Europe, South Africa and elsewhere.[11] The British Sunday school movement of the 1780s and the Mechanics' Institute movement of the 1820s both found echoes in the

United States — in some cases as a result of transatlantic visits, in others through reports and propaganda, and in the case of the Mechanics' Institute, through the emigration of Timothy Claxton to Boston.[12]

In a context such as this it is important to remember the British components. America absorbed different versions of protestantism and social ideologies from England and Scotland, different assumptions about the curriculum of higher education from Oxford and Cambridge on the one hand, and from the Scottish universities on the other. The creation of the 'godless' University College and the Anglican King's College, in London, and then the University of London covering the two, between 1826–36, indicates the different religious and international models at work in England itself, and the danger of generalizing about what England gave or received. The United States, and Canada, likewise took selectively from the British Isles in general: signals from Welsh cultural traditions and attempts at Irish national education in the early nineteenth century were quite different from those emanating from England.

The Victorian Zenith, 1850–1900

The basis of Britain's international education relations changed in relation to the growth of Britain's imperial presence. The roughly tripartite division of Britain's relations emerge: interaction with Europe, turning much more into a process of importation of ideas as industrial and economic competition showed up weaknesses and dangers; interaction with the United States, similarly becoming a trade in ideas much more tilted towards the British interest in maintaining a position and understanding what undermined it; and the new pattern of educational relations in the enormous expansion of Empire, with the variety of export models available.

Domestically, Britain's educational development was a constant mixture of confidence and confusion. The confidence was visible in the expansion of the 'system' — new 'public' schools, elementary schools or university colleges, and increasing state involvement through finance, inspection and regulation. The confusion lay in the protracted controversies which surrounded all such steps, and the uncertainties of directions to follow. Compulsion through educational or factory legislation? Expansion of technical education inside or outside the universities? Classical or modern secondary curriculum? Whether, how, where and to what level to educate girls? The steps, and the failures to move, were charted in pamphlet warfare and books, the debris of unenacted Parliamentary bills, new types of campaigning organization, public conference and debate. The creation of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science in 1857 was one indicator of this Victorian duality, with its

immense, self-confident national gatherings and its various departments, including, and notably, education. Here the intentions and the alternatives were fought over, and the model of public debate and publication was transmitted to the wider world: an American Social Science Association, equally committed to debating education, was created in 1865 as a direct outcome of the British initiative, and other echoes, in Europe and the Empire, followed. Between Britain and the United States representatives of the social science movement were exchanged and honoured, and another contribution to the internationalization of dialogue had been made.[13]

Britain's receptivity to international educational models and practices in this period falls into four categories. First, Britain was grappling with the problem of compulsory education, and Europe and the United States suggested possible directions. Prussia's centralized system was one, and the more attractive state-wide systems of the United States, particularly of Massachusetts, were another. Across the middle of the century, and in the controversies and agitation which preceded the 1870 Education Act and the introduction of compulsory attendance at the end of the 1870s, reference to the Massachusetts experience was frequent and influential, and important networks of active educationists were established, involving Members of Parliament and leading figures in, particularly, liberal and radical politics.[14] Secondly, Britain learned slowly from the International Exhibition in London in 1851, and rapidly from the Paris Exhibition of 1867, that international industrial competition was accelerating, and the competitors were mainly those countries which had been more successful than Britain in establishing a strong base of scientific and technical education. From the 1870s, in particular, British committees and commissions dealing with educational or economic issues noted the influence of the American land-grant colleges and universities, the French grandes écoles, and the technological institutions of Zürich, Delft or many German cities. The English promoters, in establishing universities outside Oxford and Cambridge, initially in London, but then from mid-century in the Midlands and the North, had Scottish models of the secular university, but also European models of technology-based or technology-and-commerce-related institutions, in mind.[15] Generations of British scholars evading the religious tests of Oxford and Cambridge had had experience of both Scottish and European higher education, and the new institutions drew on this experience and these contacts — for example, when Owens College, Manchester, brought a German in 1874 to occupy Britain's first chair of Organic Chemistry.[16] The establishment of the London polytechnics in the 1880s and 1890s, and the widening network of technical colleges, were both a response to the critical awareness in the last two decades of the nineteenth century that American and European, especially German, competition was rapidly biting into Britain's nineteenth-century role as

'workshop of the world'. The Samuelson Commission on Technical Instruction in 1884 and the Bryce Commission on Secondary Education in 1895 reported on the vigorous and accelerating role being played in the German economy by the Technische Hochschulen.

Thirdly, came the impact on late-nineteenth century British secondary education. Faced with the weak, classically-oriented network of middle-class, grammar-school and public-school education, British educationists found in Europe models of more modern and more appropriate secondary schooling. Matthew Arnold especially discovered the future of middle-class education in *A French Eton* (first published in 1863): 'to see secondary instruction treated as a matter of national concern, to see any serious attempt to make it both commensurate with the numbers needing it and of good quality, we must cross the Channel'. The lycée could be made 'cheap and accessible to all'.[17] Such advocacy of the role of the state in the provision of secondary education became part of the process which produced the Bryce Commission on secondary education in the 1890s, and an increase in grammar school provision in the early twentieth century. Fortunately, Britain received educational signals from Europe in this period in the shape of a range of educational ideas. Rival educational theories and 'sciences' increasingly competed for attention and action in Britain: the Froebelian kindergarten, Herbartian and other approaches to the phasing and structure of learning, the early interest in 'progressive' educational ideas — European and international in their configuration — including the child study movement of the 1890s and the first 'progressive' independent schools at Abbotsholme and Bedales in 1889–93. New approaches to physical education and craft education were being brought to Britain, from Scandinavia in the case of the new 'sloyd' approach to handicrafts, or from the United States in the case of the eurhythmics approach to movement.[18]

This range of educational relations contained messages carried through institutional links, new kinds of publications and organizations, official contacts and responses, the investigatory tradition of British royal and other commissions, and the development of the state and national systems of education internationally. Britain was receptive to visible clues from American and European education regarding 'progress' and 'modernization'. However reluctant Britain was to change — the reluctance being that of the once-successful pioneer — international economic relations were directing some of the changes in educational thinking and international relationships.

The important third new context was the Empire, in a situation very different from the one in which, centuries earlier, Britain had begun to plant schools in North America. In some instances, for example that of the relationships between new universities and those of the 'mother country', the dependence was direct. At the end of the nineteenth century the University of New Zealand, for example, was sending its examination

scripts to be marked by eminent British scholars in order to be assured of a form of quality control.[19] In other instances, British models were simply transplanted — very often by emigré educators. Australia and Canada, for example, found in the British 'public school' the ideal basis for the transmission of the conservative British cultural values and traditions being domesticated in the colonial setting. In both of these instances the process has been described as one, at least initially, of replicating British school structures and processes in order to transplant the underlying pattern of social-class relationships.[20] In the case of the Australian university, for example, it is argued that the new institutions, established on the pattern of the British provincial university, were in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries isolated and 'remained foreign phenomena, rather like exotics in a botanical garden... Based on British models, Australian universities in their first century did not adapt themselves to local circumstances and an increasingly independent and mature Australian culture'.[21]

Here again, however, the colonies were faced with different British models, including competing versions of conservatism — as was evident in Canada where the middle class and 'gentleman emigrants' often looked to different educational solutions. The sources of inspiration were also different. Australia, looking 'homewards', was in a different position from Canada, looking at the same time at the danger of a strong southern neighbour to her nationhood. Canada, in fact, was never sure in the late nineteenth century whether the solution was nationhood or British Empire, and educational relationships with Britain vacillated accordingly. So did the directions from which strength was drawn. Pathologically hostile to American influence, Canada frequently in the nineteenth century rejected the influence of American textbooks, and for example used Irish ones.[22] In their search for a modern university curriculum, Canadian universities looked to Scotland. With the slow development of a sense of belonging to 'Canada', even after entering the Confederation in 1871, British Columbia continued to have a 'British' orientation in its education.[23] Clearly, however, processes of adaptation were at work. The pro-British basis of Canadian education continued to hold a strong position well into the twentieth century. In Australia, on the other hand, the processes of adaptation and self-assertion were quicker to take effect, although here again there were differences among the states, and it is argued that Western Australia even today probably still absorbs more cultural influence from the 'mother country' than from the United States.[24] Levels of resistance operated from the beginning, and across all parts of the system and in educational and cultural processes of all kinds British and European traditions were being adapted.

The most successful and enduring implantation in such countries was

the British independent or 'public' school. In Victoria, the early public schools emulated the British, with headmasters, the prefect and games systems, all exerting the same kind of discipline and codes of behaviour exacted from pupils in the British setting. All of this, including the examination and university systems relating to it, was initially implanted in the context of a dominant culture whose continuance was ensured by the colonial power, and all of it was to produce lasting effects on private and public education in Australia and elsewhere.[25] British personnel, as headmasters, teachers, administrators, professors, were one channel of communication, and Australians 'soaked in British culture',[26] paying ritual visits 'home', were another. The Empire was a close cultural and educational context for the emigré British and their descendants. At system as well as institutional levels the processes of implantation and adaptation were to prove lasting. Britain's Royal Commission technique of investigation and policy influence as used in Canada, was adapted but with important differences by Canada once it had become a self-governing dominion — making them smaller and giving them more sweeping powers, for instance.[27]

The intentions and needs of the institutions and systems developed in India and the colonies of Africa, South-East Asia and the Caribbean were quite different, as were the processes by which intentions were turned into policies and realities.

Competition, Conflict and Cooperation: 1900–1945

Internationalization pulled nations and people towards and away from one another. The strongest emergent force for closer identification amongst educationists was the progressive education movement, which itself related to the international exchange of ideas about the nature of, and attitudes towards, childhood and adolescence. Textbooks of child psychology, and the related science and art of teaching, increasingly crossed the Atlantic — mainly but not exclusively in a uni-directional flow from the United States. G. Stanley Hall's first analysis of the 'problem' of *Adolescence* in 1904 had repercussions in Britain, and continued to be used and cited by educational psychologists through to the mid- and late twentieth century.[28] From Europe came Kurt Hahn and what was eventually to be the British and world-wide Outward Bound movement.[29] In many of these new approaches to the psychology or sociology of childhood, adolescence and education Britain was to be a staging post. The Sociological Society, for example, created in 1904, immediately began to look at the nature and teaching of sociology as perceived (in papers to the

Society) by Emile Durkheim in France and by a Professor of Philosophy at the University of Michigan.[30]

'Progressivism', however, was a complex phenomenon, and particularly between the two world wars found embodiment in experiments of many kinds. Many of the exponents and founders of experimental schools, such as A.S. Neill, Bertrand Russell and the Elmhursts, had strong international connections.[31] Homer Lane and others found an audience in Britain. The American Dalton Plan, with its emphasis on pupils' self-regulated study as part of an educational 'contract', had a substantial following in British elementary education, but also at the secondary level — including at the independent Bedales school.[32] The New Education Fellowship represented the new progressive internationalism. The range of progressive education activity covered schools and pressure groups, conferences and journals, a battle of ideas about children and society — and ideas circulated swiftly between Britain and continental Europe, Britain and America — and increasingly with the rest of the world. The fact that John Dewey, and Maria Montessori and others had genuinely international impacts meant that Britain's own educational relations also became increasingly complex and multi-dimensional; the relations between British educators and others were grounded in the exchange of ideas and knowledge of practices flowing in many directions. Intelligence testing, for example, was a development which linked Binet in France with its adoption and adaptation in England by Cyril Burt, in America and elsewhere, and its spread was an element in the internationalization of psychology and approaches to selection, for a variety of purposes, in widely different educational systems.[33] All of this was reflected in the consideration and promotion of international progressive ideas by British official committees in the 1920s and 1930s, for example in the Hadow Committee's report on *The Primary School* in 1931. The result was a growing tradition (some would argue an 'orthodoxy') of progressive educational theory (the practice might be interpreted differently) in schools and teacher education.

Within these international complexities other sources of outside influence or energy were discovered. In the competition for international prestige, and graduate students, the British universities found themselves, after the First World War, having to import — directly from Germany, and indirectly also from the United States — the degree of PhD and an increasing emphasis on research in universities.[34] With the rise of Nazism in Germany, Britain again became a home for the immigrant scholar, as at various points in the nineteenth century. Britain also became the recipient of international, notably American, philanthropy, partly on her own account and partly as a focal point for imperial influence. Before the turn of the century Ruskin College, Oxford, was founded by American philan-

thropy as an adult working class college.[35] London University's Senate House, School of Oriental and African Studies, London School of Economics and other of its colleges and medical schools were recipients of Rockefeller and other moneys, and American trusts and foundations supported other British and Commonwealth institutions — with motives that have been variously interpreted.[36] The Rhodes, Harkness and other scholarship schemes brought American students and staff to Britain. The diagram of British involvement with world-wide education processes had in a few decades become vastly different.

Many of these processes we have described were two-way, or multi-directional processes — particularly the international trade in progressive education. It is important to underline, however, that there were two important and related ingredients to the British participation in these relationships — reluctance and resistance. The reluctance often had to do with pride in established processes seen as distinctly British or representing a traditional quality process. The PhD was accepted reluctantly and slowly, as distorting the nature of scholarship as perceived particularly in arts and humanities areas of the British university. The American development of university course 'electives' — a product of the late nineteenth century — was successfully resisted in the first half of this century in Britain, as undermining the established three-year degree course based on sequence rather than accumulation.

What Britain was offering the international education community during this period as new contributions to the pattern of educational relationships was relatively modest. Progressive educators like A.S. Neill and Percy Nunn became internationally known (and Neill still continues to 'represent' Britain on the shelves of American campus bookstores), but the outward thrust of British education was towards the Empire, and the content of that thrust was dictated largely by the state of the balance between patronage and moves towards self-government.

Structures and Curricula: 1945–

Domestically, as in all developed countries, the main context of education after the Second World War was a period of accelerating demographic and economic expansion, followed — from some point in the 1970s — by a continuous decline. Expansion, in the case of Britain, included a debate about, and from 1964 strong Labour government pressure for, the reorganization of secondary education. Sociologists of education (some of whom, such as A.H. Halsey and Basil Bernstein, because familiar names internationally) were influential in underlining how little the post-war expansion

of secondary education had benefitted the working class, and the crucial policy issue of the 1950s and 1960s therefore became the secondary comprehensive school. In this, American and European — notably Swedish — experience became important. Lady Simon, in *Three Schools or One?* (1948) brought the American high school into the British debate, and reports by Torsten Husen and others on Swedish experiments with secondary reorganization brought research evidence into the debate.[37] For a long period in the late 1950s and 1960s the running in the comprehensive debate was made by the sociologists, on the basis of concepts such as 'equality of opportunity'.[38] At the same time, however, there were Americans (particularly following the shock waves produced by the first Soviet space successes) who were beginning to blame America's poor international performance on educational failures resulting from the dominance of 'progressive' methods. Admiral Rickover, in what became a 'back to basics' movement, took the message of the high quality of the British grammar school to the United States, just as the American comprehensive high school was becoming a thread in the pressure for change in Britain.[39]

Generally speaking, the immediate post-war decades were ones of British resistance to foreign educational models. The British were participating in educational reconstruction and 'denazification' in Western Germany after 1945. Even as the Empire began to crumble Britain was attempting to build educational bridges through increased staff and student exchange. The British primary school, the new post-war school architecture, the 'open classroom', were proving attractive to American and other educationists and teachers. Given the overwhelming emphasis of the 1940s–1960s on the secondary school, the slow build-up to the expansion of higher education from the early 1960s in particular, and the increased public attention to the primary school after the Plowden Committee reported on *Children and their Primary Schools* in 1967, there was in these first couple of decades after the war a concentration on the domestic nature of the processes, the problems and their solutions, with only occasional reference to overseas experience. Post-war anti-Americanism included a strong resistance to what were seen as American university, and to some extent high school, 'cafeteria' curricula, and to the concepts of credit accumulation and credit transfer.

The American concern with using education to combat poverty, from the Ford Foundation inner-city projects beginning in 1960, and President Johnson's declaration of a War on Poverty in 1964, is an interesting case of transatlantic acceptance and rejection. At first the American 'compensatory education' movement was disregarded in Britain as irrelevant to British experience. Head Start and other US programmes were seen as typically American, concerned with 'race' (whereas Britain was still concerned with 'immigration') and with extremes of poverty (which Britain

appeared not to have). Britain had a longer and stronger tradition of pre-school or nursery education than the United States, and since the Americans were coming to look at British schools, American education could be assumed to be more backward. The Plowden Committee visited the United States, was influenced by some aspects of American experience, spoke little about it in the report, but triggered off a British concern with 'positive discrimination' and education against poverty from the end of the 1960s, in the shape of Educational Priority Areas and other projects and policies.The work on these policies placed both pre-school and community school issues on the British agenda, and brought Britain into a new international relationship concerned with questions of disadvantage, including other countries involved with the poverty-education connection, such as Israel, Australia and France.[40]

Attention to the education of children with special needs tells a similar story. Throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries provision for children with physical or mental handicaps, in special or ordinary schools, has had international overtones, with a search for models — often different in Europe and the United States — and a search for ways of sharing information and communicating experience. Britain's commitment to special schools from the last decade of the nineteenth century came under severe scrutiny in the 1970s particularly as some other countries — notably in North America and Scandinavia–looked to 'mainstreaming' and 'normalization' as the policy future. The Warnock Report on *Special Educational Needs* underlined how much the Committee of Enquiry had had to listen and respond to this international development.[41]

The school curriculum also brought Britain into new international relations. The American focus on curriculum development which followed the Cold War and the launching of the Sputnik was one factor in the development of Nuffield and Schools Council curriculum projects in Britain in the 1960s. A move to assess pupil performance nationally, following an American example, began with the creation of the Assessment of Performance Unit (APU) in 1974. In all of these and other areas of educational experience, the traffic proved again to be two-way and multi-path. While Britain was learning about education and disadvantage from the United States, Basil Bernstein was making an important related contribution in the reverse direction, in a field of social linguistics directed towards understanding how performance in school was influenced by social class factors. Head Start and the ensuing Follow Through project in the United States developed the process of 'planned variation', under which different models of pre-school and early education were applied on different sites, in the hope of being able to evaluate the more and the less successful. The British open classroom was one of the models used, with the Leicestershire primary schools supplying one of the 'variations'. Even

more international was the development,under the impetus partly of the anti-poverty programmes, partly of the curriculum development movement, of the process and professionalization of evaluation. Styles and ideologies of evaluation moved to and from the United States, Australia and other countries.[42] The Schools Council in Britain, in its twenty years of activity from 1964, attracted considerable international attention, and its projects were 'the training ground for curriculum developers and evaluators, many of whom occupy senior positions both in the UK and around the world.'[43] Another offshoot of the British curriculum movement, the teachers' centres, also attracted international interest in the 1970s, and resulted in American and other versions.[44]

Curriculum developers, evaluators, assessment specialists and others travelled the world more in the 1960s and 1970s than ever before. Consultancy was a byword, under the auspices of the British Council, UNESCO and other international agencies. British curriculum specialists were involved in two new kinds of relationship. First was the process of adapting curriculum materials, outstandingly Nuffield science, to the needs of developing countries, conducting workshops, working collaboratively with teachers in Africa and elsewhere to produce new, locally relevant projects and materials. Secondly was the joint enterprise with specialists from other countries under UNESCO or other auspices. British curriculum development was one of the processes of interest in many countries, and joint or international teams were often found to be politically, diplomatically or educationally appropriate.

The same was true of the diversification of higher education. The American experience of the progress of state teachers colleges to state colleges to state universities between the 1960s and 1980s was paralleled in the 1970s by the creation of colleges of higher education, and the Australian colleges of advanced education. The British experience became of interest to this later Australian development and to some developing countries. The Open University played a major part in the growth of distance learning projects in many countries. Experience of course evaluation and 'validation', and institutional self-evaluation and accreditation, was increasingly exchanged. British hesitations over American-style modular courses and credit transfer began to crumble, particularly through the Council for National Academic Awards and its associated polytechnics and colleges. Direct contact between British and overseas students, educators and administrators produced enhanced attempts to interpret educational structures and experience comparatively.[45] In the 1960s and 1970s particularly, large numbers of Commonwealth, American and European students were attending British further and higher education institutions, and increasing numbers of British students were having experience of exchange with students in other countries. Rapidly expanding and cheaper

air travel resulted in educational and cultural contacts on an entirely new scale, often supported by British and world-wide organizations and — in the American case — by university and college 'international education' programmes and study locations in Britain. Internationalization was probably more real in the 1960s and 1970s than at any time since medieval Europe.

Becoming, Being and Ceasing to be British

British educationists, and British political and social theorists and activists with an interest in education, formed, at different points across these developments, part of an international community of scholars and intellectuals and educators. This was true of the medieval European universities and the seventeenth-century promoters of science and modern learning. It was true of the radical movements of the 1790s and 1830s, the progressive education movements of the 1890s–1930s, and the educational priority and curriculum development movements of the 1960s and 1970s. In many of these conditions ideas moved swiftly, whether those of Locke to Europe in the seventeenth century, Rousseau to England in the eighteenth, Owen and Wilderspin to America in the early nineteenth, or Dewey and Montessori to Britain in the early twentieth century. The transmitting agents, then as now, were books and journals, and people — journalists, radical politicians, professors, headmasters, teachers, students. The transmissions have been direct and oblique, conservative and innovative, from positions of equality and dominance.

British educational ideas and institutions have to be seen also in the context of Empire and Commonwealth, of those parts of the world which Britain sought to refashion or 'modernize' in her own image. People were captured (some argued 'rescued') for British ways, and education either on British models or for British ideologies. Britain — with intentions often different from, for instance French assimilationist policies — fashioned colonial educational policies with an eye often both to imperial power and to some form of self-government. When 'self-government' gave way to independence, educational relationships were not always broken or traditions abandoned. Under changed auspices these British relations, not always with the same magnitude of impact or outcome, were often maintained. Debates, including about colonialism and neo-colonialism, had a pronounced, often a crucial, educational content. British educators continued to give, and to receive, to be partners and members of the same international communities — not always, of course, on equal terms.

A description and analysis of British educational relations has therefore to respond to the issues relating to Britain's dual role as consumer and

170

provider. In terms of mass education and the independent public schools, Oxford and Cambridge and the 'civic' universities, radical ideas and cultural norms, the story is often uni-directional. It has frequently, however, been one of complex reciprocal relationships. It has raised questions of the exercise of influence and power, of success and failure in policy formulation and implementation measured by different criteria, and of the roles of education in or apart from the political, social, economic and other dimensions of formal and informal systems of education, and Britain's national development and international presence. Even across countries and continents where the intentions have been similar, differences of outcome have to be accounted for. Even where pronounced national similarities may be evident, the reasons for differences in receptivity and interpretation have to be addressed. Such issues are common to the educational worlds of the United States or France, Spain or the Soviet Union. What we have seen here are merely some of the ways of discerning the often indistinct shapes of one country's educational worlds. A closer understanding of the forces which underpin educational change requires an attempt to interpret the meaning and effects of what takes place in those worlds, the ways in which ideologies triumph or are reprocessed, how education itself becomes a locus in the negotiation not only of ideas but also of power. The policy process resides in, takes shape from, and helps to explain some of those phenomena.

Notes

1 For example: Gray Cowan, L. (1964) 'British and French education in Africa: A critical appraisal' in Piper, D.C. and Taylor, C. (Eds) *Post-Primary Education and Political and Economic Development*, Durham, NC, Duke University Press; Carr-Saunders, A.M. (1965) 'Britain and universities in Africa', *Universities Quarterly*, 19, 3; Fordham, P. (1970) 'Adapting a tradition — extramural policy in Africa', *Universities Quarterly*, 25, 1; Altbach, P.G. and Kelly, G.P. (Eds) (1978) *Education, and Colonialism*, New York, Longmans; Schilling, D.G. (1980) 'The dynamics of education policy formation: Kenya 1928–1934', *History of Education Quarterly*, 20, 1; Fletcher, L. (1982) 'Early British colonial school inspectors: Agents of imperialism?', *History of Education*, 11, 4; Whitehead, C. (1984) 'The education of women and girls: An aspect of British colonial policy', *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 16, 2; Whitehead, C. (1987) 'The "two-way pull" and the establishment of university education in British West Africa', *History of Education*, 16, 2.

2 See the series of books by Armytage, W.H.G. (1967) on *The American Influence on English Education*, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, and similar titles on the French (1968), German (1969) and Russian (1969) influences.

3 Silver, H. (1965) *The Concept of Popular Education: A Study of Ideas and*

Social Movements in the Early Nineteenth Century, London, MacGibbon & Kee, chapter 1.

4 See *ibid.*, pp. 42–52.

5 KAY-SHUTTLEWORTH, J. (1862) *Four Periods of Public Education*, Brighton, Harvester Press, 1973 edn, p. 289; 'Report on the Training of Pauper Children, 1838', in Poor Law Commissioners (1839) Manchester, E.J. Morten, 1970 edn, pp. 29–30.

6 STEWART, W.A.C. and MCCANN, W.P. (1967) *The Educational Innovators 1750–1880*, London, Macmillan.

7 AXTELL, J. (1974) *The School Upon a Hill: Education and Society in Colonial New England*, New Haven, CT, Yale University Press.

8 For a recent survey see KAESTLE, C.F. (1985) 'The history of literacy and the history of leaders' in GORDON, E.W. (Ed.), *Review of Research in Education*, vol 12, Washington, DC, American Educational Research Association.

9 HALE BELLOT, H. (1929) *University College London 1826–1926*, London, University of London Press.

10 KAESTLE, C.F. (Ed.) (1973) *Joseph Lancaster and the Monitorial School System: A Documentary History*, New York, Teachers College Press; RAYMAN, R. (1981) 'Joseph Lancaster's monitorial system of instruction and American Indian education, 1815–1838', *History of Education Quarterly*, 21, 4.

11 MCCANN, P. and YOUNG, F.A. (1952) *Samuel Wilderspin and the Infant School Movement*, London, Croom Helm.

12 THISTLETHWAITE, F. (1959) *The Anglo-American Connection in the Early Nineteenth Century*, Philadelphia, PA, University of Pennsylvania Press, p. 138.

13 SILVER, H. (1983) *Education as History*, London, Methuen, (chapter 5, 'Social science and educational reform: Britain and America in the late nineteenth century').

14 FARRAR, N. (1964) *The influence of the Massachusetts system of education on the movement for a national system in England and Wales*, MA dissertation, University of Liverpool; JONES, D.K. (1977) *The Making of the Education System 1851–81*, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

15 ASHBY, E. (1963) *Technology and the Academics*, London, Macmillan; LOWE, R. (1982) 'The expansion of higher education in England' in JARAUSCH, K.H. (Ed.) *The Transformation of Higher Learning 1860–1930*, Stuttgart, Klett-Cotta.

16 CHARLTON, H.B. (1951) *Portrait of a University 1851–1951*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, p. 66.

17 ARNOLD, M. (1863) 'A French Eton' in SUPER, R.H. (Ed.) *Matthew Arnold: Democratic Education*, Ann Arbor, MI, University of Michigan Press, pp. 264 and 322.

18 SELLECK, R.J.W. (1968) *The New Education 1870–1914*, London, Pitman, chapter 4, 'The practical educationists'.

19 Board of Education (1901) *Special Reports on Educational Subjects*, HMSO, 1901, Vol. 5, chapter on 'The system of education in New Zealand', p. 654.

20 For example, BARMAN, J. (1984) *Growing up British in British Columbia: Boys in Private School*, Vancouver, University of British Columbia Press; DUNAE, P.A. (1981) *Gentleman Emigrants: From the British Public Schools to the Canadian Frontier*, Vancouver, Douglas & McIntyre; LEINSTER-MACKAY, D. and HANCOCK, G. (1979) 'Godliness, manliness and good learn-

ing: Victorian virtues and Western Australian examplars, 1891–1911' in MURRAY-SMITH, S.L. (Ed.) *Melbourne Studies in Education*, Melbourne, Melbourne University Press.

21 JONES, D.R. (1985) 'A century of exoticism: Australian universities 1850–1950', *History of Education Review*, 14, 1. See also MCLAREN, J. (1979) 'Humanities in Australian education' in MURRAY-SMITH, S.L. (Ed.) (1979) *op cit*.

22 For Canadian resistance to American models see WILSON, J.D. (1970) 'Education in Upper Canada: Sixty years of change' in WILSON, J.D. *et al*. (Eds) *Canadian Education: A History*, Scarborough, Ontario, Prentice-Hall; HOUSTON, S. (1975) 'Politics, schools, and social change in Upper Canada' in KATZ, M.B. and MATTINGLY, P.H. (Eds) *Education and Social Change: Themes from Ontario's Past*, New York, New York University Press; TOMKINS, G. (1977) 'Canadian education and the development of a national consciousness: Historical and contemporary perspectives' in CHAITON, A. and MCDONALD, N. (Eds) *Canadian Schools and Canadian Identity*, Toronto, Gage Educational Publishing; LOVE, J. (1984) 'Anti-American ideology and education reform in 19th century Upper Canada' in WILSON, J.D. (Ed.) *An Imperfect Past: Education and Society in Canadian History*, Vancouver, University of British Columbia.

23 For this orientation in higher education see HARRIS, R.S. (1976) *A History of Higher Education in Canada 1663–1960*, Toronto, University of Toronto Press. The complexities of Canada's relationships with Britain and the United States are discussed in the introduction to KATZ, M.B. and MATTINGLY, P.H. (Eds) (1975) *Education and Social Change*, and in terms of higher education in SILVA, E. (1980) 'Maple leaf, British bough, American branch: Canadian higher education in developmental perspective' in SPITZBERG JR, I. (Ed.), *Universities and the International Distribution of Knowledge*, New York, Praeger.

24 LEINSTER-MACKAY, D. and HANCOCK, G. (1979) *op cit*, p. 141.

25 For example, BESSANT, B. (1984) 'The influence of the "public schools" on the early high schools of Victoria', *History of Education Review*, 13, 1. The process of adaptation is discussed in JONES, D.R. (1983) *Sea Change: British Models and Colonial Modifications in Higher Education*, Melbourne, Centre for the Study of Higher Education, University of Melbourne.

26 SELLECK, R.J.W. (1982) *Frank Tate: A Biography*, Melbourne, Melbourne University Press, pp. 98–102.

27 GOULSON, C.F. (1981) *A Source Book of Royal Commissions and other Major Governmental Inquiries in Canadian Education 1787–1978*, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, p. xiii.

28 See, for example, MUSGROVE, F. (1967) 'Childhood and adolescence' in Schools Council (Ed.) *The Educational Implications of Social and Economic Change*, London, HMSO; CHAZAN, M. (1966) 'Emotional development in adolescence' in HEMMING, J. *et al*. (Eds) *The Psychology of Adolescence*, Swansea, University College of Swansea.

29 RÖHRS, H. and TUNSTALL BEHRENS, H. (Eds) (1966) *Kurt Hahn*, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

30 Sociological Society (1905 and 1907) *Sociological Papers*. In 1907 Professor R.M. Wenley from Michigan presented a paper on 'Sociology as an academic subject'.

31 BOYD, W. and RAWSON, W. (1965) *The Story of the New Education*, London, Heinemann, for this new kind of 'international club'.

32 LYNCH, A.J. (1924) *Individual Work and the Dalton Plan*, London, George Philip; SELLECK, R.J.W. (1972) *English Primary Education and the Progressives, 1914–1939*, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

33 SUTHERLAND, G. (1984) *Ability, Merit and Measurement: Mental Testing and English Education 1880–1940*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, pp. 53–6.

34 SIMPSON, R. (1984) *How the PhD Came to Britain*, Guildford, Society for Research into Higher Education.

35 POLLINS, H. (1984) *The History of Ruskin College*, Oxford, Ruskin College Library, pp. 11–12.

36 For example, FISHER, D. (1978) 'Rockefeller philanthropy and the British Empire: The creation of the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine', *History of Education*, 7, 2; FISHER, D. (1980) 'American philanthropy and the social sciences; The reproduction of a conservative ideology' in ARNOVE, R.F. (Ed.) *Philanthropy and Cultural Imperialism: The Foundations at Home and Abroad*, Boston, MA, G.K. Hall.

37 LADY SIMON of Wythenshawe (1948) *Three Schools or One? Secondary Education in England, Scotland and the U.S.A.*, London, Frederick Muller; PEDLEY, R. (1963) *The Comprehensive School*, Harmondsworth, Penguin, pp. 162–4 (section on Sweden).

38 See SILVER, H. (Ed.) (1973) *Equal Opportunity in Education*, London, Methuen.

39 RICKOVER, H.G. (1963) *American Education — A National Failure: The Problem of Our Schools and What we can learn from England*, New York, Dutton.

40 SILVER, H. (1963) 'Education against poverty: Interpreting British and American policies in the 1960s and 1970s' *op cit*, chapter 10; FENSHAM, P.J. (Ed.) (1970) *Rights and Inequality in Australian Education*, Melbourne, F.W. Cheshire; CRESAS (1985) *Depuis 1981, l'école pour tous? Zones d'Éducation Prioritaires*, Paris, L'Harmattan.

41 Committee of Enquiry into the Education of Handicapped Children and Young People (1978) *Special Educational Needs*, (The Warnock Report) London, HMSO.

42 HAMILTON, D. *et al.* (1977) *Beyond the Numbers Game: A Reader in Educational Evaluation*, London, Macmillan.

43 PLASKOW, M. (1985) 'The life and death of the Schools Council — A long view from the inside' in PLASKOW, M. (Ed.) *Life and Death of the Schools Council*, Lewes, Falmer Press, p. 7.

44 THORNBURY, R.E. (Ed.) (1973) *Teachers' Centres*, London, Darton, Longman and Todd, p. 1.

45 KLINEBERG, O. (1976) *International Educational Exchange: An Assessment of its Nature and Purpose*, The Hague, Mouton; CHANDLER, A. (1985) *Foreign Students and Government Policy: Britain, France and Germany*, Washington, DC, American Council on Education.

Chapter 8

Zeal as a Historical Process: The American View from the 1980s

The title originates in that most formidable of books on the history of American education, Merle Curti's *The Social Ideas of American Educators*. It is over half a century since he wrote that mass education was not merely a democratic American movement, but also 'in part a product of the industrial capitalism rapidly becoming dominant throughout the western world'. He continued:

> We tend today to think of our American system of public schools as having been founded out of a great zeal for the welfare of the plain people. But actually this zeal was tempered by zeal for the welfare of the employers of labor, by zeal for maintaining the political and social *status quo*. These economic motives were frankly recognized in the days of the founding. Now, however . . . we . . . recognize only the more idealistic motives, which were of course also operative.[1]

All the controversies around American education in the 1960s and after were no more than attempts to explicate that analysis. Whose zeal or combination of zeals? Embodied in what? For what single-minded or complex purposes? To perpetuate what, to change what? And now remembered and explained by whom, how? American history of education written in the 1980s has extended both Curti's and the 1960s agendas, the latter being the one most familiar to a world intrigued by America's prolific varieties of revision.

The importance of the American historiography of the 1980s for our discussion here lies in its relation to what was discussed in chapter 1 in terms of 'alternative pasts'. The dominant tone of American history of education in the 1960s and 1970s was one of revision and reinterpretation, of a new start in explaining America's educational past in the context of a mounting critique of America's social and political past. After the path-breaking publications in the early 1960s — Bernard Bailyn's *Education*

in the Forming of American Society (1960) and Lawrence Cremin's *The Wonderful World of Ellwood Patterson Cubberley* (1965) — the dominant historical analyses came from Marxist, neo-Marxist, anarchist and other radical directions. The dominant vocabularies of analysis became those of social control and class reproduction, sorting and hegemony. An alternative picture was being constructed to the earlier twentieth-century picture of America's progressive democracy, education as the heart of the republican record and America's version of a democratic national religion. Class and exploitation, racial oppression and the destruction of ethnic cultures, the oppression of women and the export of American capitalism, the dominance of the corporate state and the subservience of education by various processes to these ends, were persistent themes in this alternative picture of America's educational past.

What the 1980s witnessed was a widening of the alternatives, a search for more detailed and more subtle accounts and explanations. In part this was a rejection of some of the blatancies of the previous decade, in part a thoughtful emanation from them. As we have seen in the cases of the third volume of Cremin's history of *American Education* and Jorgenson's history of attitudes towards Catholic education, other kinds of voice with other kinds of vision were contributing to the portrayal of America's schools and wider educational contexts. The first half of the 1980s produced in America an important diversity of historical directions and interpretations in education, and offers a cameo of how historians can view the complexities of educational processes and change. The attempt here, therefore, is to consider some of the output of American historians of education in roughly the first half of the 1980s, in order to come from a different direction to the ways in which historians contribute to the construction of 'alternative pasts', including the kinds of policy processes we have discussed in previous chapters. In 1980 Lawrence Cremin published the second volume of his history of American education, *The National Experience 1783–1876*. Alongside it, similar in scale, less directly 'educational' in concern, but leading an important and relevant field of scholarship, was Leon F. Litwack's *Been in the Storm So Long*, a penetrating account of 'The aftermath of slavery' — including its educational dimensions. More modest in scale, but an event, was Michael Walzer's *Radical Principles: Reflections of an Unreconstructed Democrat*, even further from the apparent concerns of educational historians, but one of the most valuable contributions to the political and social sciences from which historians draw organizing concepts and assumptions, and addressing the range of issues and ideas with which historians have become engaged.[2] There are other signals from 1980, but there would doubtless be plausible reasons for beginning with 1977 or 1981 or any other date. Decades and round numbers are purely for convenience.

Revision, Reform and Control

The revisionism of the 1960s has long been broken down into sub-categories, attacked, bypassed and re-revised. It is now common for historians of the long and intricate educational sweep or the cameo to situate their endeavours in the 'brands' of revisionism, and even when rejecting its basis and direction, to acknowledge that Michael Katz and others usefully broke a 'progressive mould'.[3] Critiques of the more stringent revisionist positions of the 1960s came from a variety of starting points. Sol Cohen, for example, rejected the revisionist refusal to accept the presence or significance of 'do good' motivation and action in the historical process — by Foucault, for example, as well as American versions.[4] Peterson, Katznelson and Weir, and others, attacked the revisionist positions of Katz or Bowles and Gintis as over-simplified pictures of the complex and differentiated class, ethnic and other relationships at local levels more diverse than allowed for in the revisionist world picture.[5] The revisionist interpretations of Katz, Greer and others in the late 1960s, built upon and generalized in more theoretical terms by Bowles and Gintis in *Schooling in Capitalist America* (1976), were held by some historians to be simply evasions of parts of the reality they claimed to represent — the role of the working class in the progressive period in some cities, for example,[6] or the cultural diversity and forms of action of immigrant groups not conforming to the simple models of 'Americanization' or socialization offered in earlier accounts. Weiss and others, looking in detail at *American Education and the European Immigrant* in the century from 1840 rejected the revisionist stress on economic factors as negating the role of various kinds of cultural heritage, explored the immigrant responses to 'cultural imperialism', and despite the strength of 'Americanization' movements emphasized various commitments to alternative immigrant education and refused to accept the revisionist implication of immigrants as passive recipients of an established host culture and educational forms.[7]

What emerged in the context of such critiques was not some return to previously questioned historical explanations, but a focus on more complex and wide-ranging description and analysis — not in order to avoid the issues raised by earlier revisionist scholarship, but in order to subject disputed realities to more elaborate tests. In many cases the process of historical revision remained clear and explicit. Historians of different kinds followed their own previously-established positions with modified analyses: one review of Cremin's *National Experience* volume, for instance, looked at a shift in his interpretation of the role of the church and other agencies and described him as 'his own best revisionist'.[8] The concepts of bureaucratization and centralization, crucial to some of the earlier work of

Tyack and others in relation to urban developments in the progressive era in particular, were subjected to substantial modification following further research — including by the authors themselves. A significant feature of much historical analysis was its refusal to accept conceptual pictures of what happened as in any way explaining why it happened. Hogan, in an early version of his crucially important analysis of Chicago, looked, for example, at increasing, voluntary educational behaviour by the working class, and reflected that the notion of hegemony could not *explain* such working-class pro-educational activity.[9] Berman, retesting Callahan's thesis of *Education and the Cult of Efficiency* (1962) found his business efficiency argument, or more correctly description of the trend of the early twentieth century, acceptable, but pushed the analysis back into the nineteenth century. She found the ideology that Callahan was describing present in the common school reform movement, and the roots of the change there, and not around 1900 as Callahan had claimed. What Callahan had not done, therefore, was *explain* how and why the efficiency doctrine came to be adopted to the extent that it did at the point that it did.[10] In breaking a mould — or breaking it more extensively than Curti and others had done in an earlier generation — the waves of revisionist scholarship had ultimately made it necessary for historians of education to look in considerably greater detail at the precise working of the schools, wider educational and social processes, and the contents and methodologies of their approach.

The generic issues most addressed by the revisionist history of the late 1960s, and sustained in one way or another subsequently, were the related ones of reform and social control. Nineteenth-century reforms and reformers, and perhaps most frequently the 'progressive reform' of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, have been under persistent scrutiny — encompassing issues of elite domination, race, ethnicity, school administration, curriculum change, and much more. Historians in the early 1980s pursued the ideas and practices of varieties of reform — Cohen and Mohl, for example, discussed the Gary Plan and progressivism in the context of liberal and conservative reform, Hogan and others disentangled the different languages of reform, and Peterson considered the plural sources of reform.[11] Shapiro, in a study of the history of the kindergarten movement, examined competing versions of, for example, child study and later progressivism in a historiography concerned primarily with ideas; Kaestle, in a wide-ranging study of the common school mainly in the first half of the nineteenth century, considered the diverse agendas of common school reform, combining analyses of morality, republicanism, protestantism and the ideologies of schooling, with accounts of regional and local differences in the processes of schooling.[12] At other levels, and with different focus, Brenzel traced the degeneration of idealist

reform in a particular institution — the first reform school for girls — into punitive practices. Reese looked at a number of localities in terms of reforming processes as outcomes of rival, interacting and differently balanced social class and other groupings.[13]

It is impossible, in the changed parameters of history of education established in recent decades, to consider issues of reform purely in terms of schooling or even of 'education' as understood in the past. Brenzel's account of the loss of reforming vision, the transition from a belief in child innocence to practices in the end 'hardly different from a prison',[14] has to be seen in relation to other historical attention to institutions. Rothman, for example, following his influential study of the nineteenth century in *The Discovery of the Asylum* (1971), examined 'the asylum and its alternatives' in *Conscience and Convenience*, rejecting what he saw as a 'capitalist inevitability' argument used by Foucault as ideologue. In relation to criminal justice, juvenile justice and mental health he traced, as did Brenzel, the degeneration of reform ideals which have complex motivations into limited and repressive practices. He attempted at the same time, however, to establish what were available alternatives, and to judge what, in given situations, might have been worse.[15] The historiography of education, therefore, becomes a diagram extending in many directions, towards reform and the nature of the state in relation to the family and the child, towards the nature of work and the labour market, socio-technical theory and approaches to learning.[16] The nature of reform, similarly, pointed historians towards continued attention to the work of key figures at times of crucial importance to historical interpretation — with the progressive era featuring centrally in the process. Margaret Haley (whose autobiography begins: 'I never wanted to fight') and her role in teacher unionism and feminism is one such figure, raising questions about the difference between 'progressive reform' and 'progressive educational reform', compromise and the nature and purpose of political coalition and strategy.[17]

Central to much early revisionist work was the notion of social control or manipulation, domination overt or what came to be known as hegemonic, a view of class domination or, in the terms of Bowles and Gintis, the use of education to effect economic or class reproduction. Versions ranged from direct conspiracy theories (of power exerted by ruling elites within corporate capitalism) to those of 'liberal' attempts to protect the status quo for a democracy which tolerated class and racial oppression. Little of the early 1980s historical work concerned with education and class followed that path, and much confronted and explicitly rejected it. At the turn of the 1980s there were still strong versions of social-control history, one of the strongest being the collection edited by Arnove under the title *Philanthropy and Cultural Imperialism: The Foundations at Home*

and Abroad.[18] In it Arnove and others used the whole apparatus of 'hegemony', 'manufacturing ideology', legitimation of the social order and defence of the interests of 'the corporate ruling class'. Arnove explains:

> A central thesis is that foundations like Carnegie, Rockefeller, and Ford have a corrosive influence on a democratic society; they represent relatively unregulated and unaccountable concentrations of power and wealth which buy talent, promote causes, and, in effect, establish an agenda of what merits society's attention ... delaying and preventing more radical, structural change.[19]

Darknell, considering Carnegie's role in higher education, concludes that it 'has consistently developed and promoted higher education policies primarily in the interests of the American corporate ruling class'.[20]

The Arnove contributors generally identified a simple, overriding process of power and manipulation, as did some of the revisionist historians of the previous decade. Lagemann, in a study of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching published in 1983, was critical of the Foundation, but traced a process of agenda-formation which was less uni-directional. She saw the 'private power for the public good' ascribed to it as problematical, but tempered the top-down view of the role of the Foundation with an analysis of how causes and interests are negotiated.[21]

The last fling of 1960s–1970s revisionist historiography was really David Nasaw's attempt to encapsulate it all in the story of American education's balance sheet of gain (expansion) and loss (most other things). *Schooled to Order* (1979) turned revisionist historiography into a new Plain Man's Guide.[22] Three chosen periods and themes demonstrated (i) the common school launched towards a watchdog role over the young; (ii) the high school triumphantly tracking and sorting; and (iii) higher education providing for the needs of everyone except the majority of its students. The parochial school issue, adolescence, vocational education, the community college — all sources of controversy amongst historians and social scientists — became information and assertions which signalled the end of revisionism as a dynamic movement in American historiography. The history of public schooling, Nasaw announced, was cause for a little celebration and a lot of lament:

> In either case, we are avoiding the obvious: that the public schools are social institutions dedicated *not* to meeting the self-perceived needs of their students but to preserving social peace and prosperity within the context of private property and the governmental structures that safeguard it.[23]

What the 1980s had produced was a widespread sense of dissatisfaction with the simplicities or exaggerations of social control explanations, however formulated. Kaestle and Vinovskis, for example, reexamined the Bowles and Gintis theme of nineteenth-century schooling inculcating work attitudes on behalf of the capitalist economy, and found the theme 'exaggerated'.[24] Finkelstein examined the work of historians like Foucault and Ignatieff, their portrait of an 'orgy of institution-building' in the first seventy years of the nineteenth century, and the imposition on children of 'the rule of reason' — and then turned to other historians who, she believed 'harbor a more complex, and . . . historically more complete view of the expansion of institution-building'.[25]

The main thrust in dismantling theories of social control in relation to educational history came — as we have seen — from those historians concerned to explore in greater detail the complex operations of class relationships. Peterson, Hogan, Katznelson and colleagues began to suggest at an early stage of research on Chicago and other cities that revisionist explanations had been simplistic. An analysis of the specific case of reform in Chicago in 1917 — the Otis law — led to an explicit rejection of earlier historical interpretations by Joel Spring, Michael Katz and Bowles and Gintis as being as limited in perspective as the histories they rejected:

> They described schools as the product of some single force at work in society or some limited group of individuals exercizing inordinate influence... The Otis law compromise ... suggests a pattern of interaction among competing groups, a far cry from the unitary social domination and control models of the revisionist histories covering the period.[26]

All the work we have cited by Hogan, Peterson, Reese and others chipped away at the social control edifice, or rejected it. Hogan, for example, looked at past attempts to explain immigrant educational behaviour as a result of 'imposition' by Progressive reformers of 'American values':

> It is possible to argue that such changes reflect a successful strategy of social control... The evidence, however, does not support such an interpretation. It points instead to an explanation focused on the process of class formation: the remaking of the Chicago working class.[27]

Social control was being exorcized as oversimplified, or wrong.

Directions

American history of education turned in the early 1980s towards some new themes, or to a renewed interest in some older ones. For some historians

educational policy issues moved sharply into focus. In some cases this involved a search for levels at which to narrate and explain policy processes, decisions and outcomes, and attention might be to process at a single level or to interaction at multiple and complex levels. In relation to major national policy decisions, an analysis such as that of Clowse, concerned with the impact of 'the Sputnik crisis' and the passing of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, pursued the pattern of federal decision-making.[28] Graham, similarly, tracing federal education policy in the Kennedy and Johnson periods, built a narrative of the federal forces at work in shaping policy, overcoming political obstacles, building coalitions and finding political ways and means.[29] In both of these cases the purpose was the historical rescue of recent processes with only side-glances at the significance of policy and policy analysis, and with little or no attempt to suggest judgments. A treatment of the same ground by Kaestle and Smith — 'The federal role in elementary and secondary education, 1940–1980' — attempted to go beyond the policy narrative to examine the validity of the stereotypical views of federal involvement found in the case histories of the period, and to attempt judgment on the record and direction of federal involvement.[30] Over different timescales, for example, Prucha looked at the texture of decision-making at the federal level regarding the Catholic church and the Indian schools in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The story of Congress, pressure groups, Presidents and personalities leaves Indians and classrooms in fact off stage.[31] Grubb and Lazerson, however, looking at policy-making relating to children, were making an overriding, explicit point from the outset — the way in which the system and its policies had blamed the family, blamed women, stigmatized, labelled, and harnessed children and the family to the needs of the state. Historical treatment of policy, in their terms, involved interpretation and judgment.[32]

Policy history operated in other ways. Tyack and James, for instance, explicitly returned to an older interest in the educational activities of the individual states, in pursuit of explanations of difference, the roles and influences at work in policy-making (superintendents, legislatures, transitory interest groups, the export of bureaucratic models from state to state, the courts...). As in Tyack's other work on the 1980s there was here a clear attempt to analyze and understand the political variations and ideological diversities at work, in complex cross-state (and, the authors suggest, cross-national) settings.[33] Rothman's work on the asylum, of major significance to consideration of schooling and related social institutions, was directed towards understanding the relationship between policy and practice.[34]

Perhaps the most ambitious attempt to write multi-level policy history was Ravitch's study of American education since 1945 (with consider-

able rear-glances to earlier decades), in *The Troubled Crusade*. Ravitch tried to establish the nature of policy making and the impact of particular policies, amid the changing social and economic contexts of education. The same issues and focal points as, for example, in Nasaw or other texts covering the period, were inevitably present — pressures for and against federal involvement, race, civil rights, curriculum reform... Although the canvas is broad, and the themes varied, there was an attempt by Ravitch to retain a sense of the interaction of large-scale political processes, the influence of ideas and the shifting focus of issues, and the processes of education. She emphasized, for example, the inability of early liberal legislation on race to 'wish away' race consciousness; the fragility of academic freedom in the conflicts of left and right; the outcomes for schools of the curriculum reform era; the increasing complexity of the relations between government and education; the ways in which schools were opened up to public attention and scrutiny of various kinds; the changing relationships of teachers and public. Historical judgment, often positive, was visible. Policy was seen as a complex continuum encompassing Congress and classroom.[35]

An important thread in policy interests was the historiographic interest in educational policy analysis as such, the nature of a history-policy connection. Resnick discussed the relationship between 'Educational policy and the applied historian', suggesting that applied historical analysis can point towards alternative courses of action.[36] Most historians of education concerned with policy issues did not, however, go in this direction (one not unrelated to the emergence of 'public history' and discussion of the usefulness of history), though any form of policy analysis pointed by definition towards possible usable outcomes. Hansot and Tyack, in fact, discussed the process in precisely that vocabulary — 'A usable past: Using history in educational policy' — looking substantively at three historical periods, and concluding that the main virtue of historical policy analysis was to persuade policy-makers not to reinvent the wheel, and to place the immediacy of solutions in the longer perspective of the history of problems.[37] Warren, in one of the most searching discussions of 'historical policy analysis', used a case history of federal interest in education to approach the kinds of contribution history could make, not only to the history of policy, but also to the research base, analysis and outcomes of policy:

> The research possibilities invite the collaboration of historians and political scientists in ways of knowing the multiple sources, forms, and effects of education policy. They also address contemporary policy problems, if only by offering to reduce the likelihood of uncalculated recycling of old solutions.[38]

In the United States, as in a number of other countries, the history of literacy was emerging as a direction of interest for historians of education, economic, social and cultural historians, and others. One of the earliest attempts to situate American literacy in an international context and with a specific emphasis on historical changes in expectations of literacy was that of Daniel and Lauren Resnick in 1977, using historical analysis to dispel false assumptions about a decline in literacy or the need to return to older educational practices. Changed circumstances, they underlined, made comparisons with the past difficult, and previous practices inappropriate.[39] Graff, from 1979, conducted an influential historical campaign to dispel a different range of myths — that primary schooling and literacy were necessary for economic and social development, for the establishment and maintenance of democratic institutions, for individual advancement, and so on. Drawing on Canadian and other evidence, Graff had messages for American historiography of literacy without being specifically concerned with the American experience — though he attacked the various versions of a distinctive American ideology of literacy (that is, that Americans were somehow born different, into a different culture of literacy). Graff, in attacking most explanations of the history of literacy, offered only unclear pointers to acceptable historical interpretations, but opened up further a field which, as he pointed out in 1983, was by then no more than fifteen-years-old.[40] Coming together at this point were the history of schooling, the history of a range of social and cultural processes, demographic, economic and other histories. Soltow and Stevens summarized their study of literacy and the common school prior to 1870:

> By mid-nineteenth century basic literacy had become a cultural imperative in the United States. Evangelical Protestant morality, a fervent nationalism, and an ethic of capitalism which recognized the commercial value of a literate public had made literacy a high-priority social cause.[41]

Kaestle, in a study of *The History of Literacy and the History of Readers* placed the new direction of historical interest in the context of the new social history and the interest in policy issues. His own study placed emphasis not on the possession of nominal literacy but on its use — again drawing on international explanations of the history of literacy (in terms of demography and religion, class and ideology), and on the impact of literacy on educational values and aims.[42]

The detailed, local analysis of educational history as it related to soci[al] class across the nineteenth and twentieth centuries was accompanied by an emergent interest in radical and working-class educational endeavours, an interest often sparked by an awareness of British and European contributions to labour history and to the points of intersection between

labour and educational history. Reese's study of the progressive period, for example, involved a close look at labour and socialist organization in relation to schooling, in Milwaukee and other cities.[43] Specific labour movement ventures in education (often seen as alternatives to the reform of public institutions) began to receive historical attention. Altenbaugh looked at Brookwood Labor College and the American Labor College movement in the 1920s and 1930s, bringing the socialist Sunday schools into the historical picture. Leslie looked at a range of socialist 'alternative' educational efforts in the first two decades of this century. Avrich explored the history of anarchist educational experiment.[44] American historians were beginning to discover a radical past which had educational implications, as well as locating the specific directions and impacts of working-class involvement in the public arena.

A final example of an accelerating interest is that of curriculum history. There were strands of curriculum interest in earlier revisionist history — concerned, for example, with the school as a sorting agency, Sputnik and the Cold War, or vocationalism. Historians in the early 1980s continued to look at periods of curriculum reform, but — as in Britain — discovered the curriculum as a historical process. Kliebard and Franklin, in a social historical framework, considered how social groups select knowledge, how change takes place, and fails to take place. Kliebard then went on to trace *The Struggle for the American Curriculum 1893–1958*, outlining the major forces at work — though mainly in terms of the history of theories of the curriculum, somewhat disembodied from any sense of the history of the curriculum itself as a school process. Franklin, similarly, went on to build a picture of the history of theories of social control and their relevance to thinking about curriculum (including a case study of Minneapolis).[45] Other historians focussed specifically on the conservative nature of the curriculum, in the context of discussions of particular moments of curriculum challenge — including vocationalism early in the century, and attempts at reform from the 1960s.[46] An important element in the studies of individual cities by Peterson and others was the intense debate and conflict over vocational secondary education, mother tongue teaching and bilingualism in the progressive era. The directions of historical interest were interrelated.

Approaches

At the American Educational Studies Association in 1982 Barbara Finkelstein began her presidential address:

> For the past decade, I have been singing only one educational song. It is a song with a theme and variations. Its title is: 'Where

> Have All the People Gone?'... It is not popular music, but it is important music.

She castigated education scholars — whether historians or policy analysts — for a 'virtual insensitivity to how people learn', for defining education as what is taught, excluding 'what might or might not be learned'. It was a case of 'people-myopia'.[47] Here as elsewhere Finkelstein pointed to the family, to child-rearing, to children's relationships with adults and with peers, to the ways children make sense of their environment, the media, school, as a missing element in much educational history. Others approached educational history with the same intention of restoring children to a more complex and interactive world than historians previously allowed. Clifford continued to urge the importance of personal records and biography. Cohen pressed the case for histories of personality, motivation, behaviour as interpreted by psychiatry.[48] An important approach to educational history which emerged in this period was the attempt to bring the people of education — children, teachers, policy activists, families — into the historical picture, or perhaps more often to advocate that efforts be made to accomplish this.

One pointer to the way in which this is possible was Cuban's *How Teachers Taught*, which explained in its sub-title that it focussed on 'Constancy and change in American classrooms 1890–1980'. Cuban used a variety of sources and methods to consider the persistence of teacher-centred processes and the impact of child-centred or progressive methods. He demonstrated differences between the contest at elementary and secondary levels, the existence and nature of strong progressive minorities, the extent of 'informal', 'open' or 'alternative' classroom approaches, and such issues as the impact, if any, of innovative methods on individual classrooms or whole schools. The story was built up on the basis of the intensive use of a small number of local records, including the interpretation of photographs, and the outcome was one kind of answer to Finkelstein's question.[49] Kaestle complained that not enough attention, in discussions of ideology, was paid to the ideologies of the people historians write about.[50] Dyer rescued from the nineteenth century, through diaries and letters, a Georgia teacher whose life and work emerge with considerable clarity. Brenzel's study of the Lancaster reform school for girls attempted to establish who they were, how they were treated, with what outcomes, combining an analysis of social forces with an attempt to discover the girls' personal lives.[51] Tyack and Hansot, in one of the most remarkable contributions to educational history, *Managers of Virtue*, pursued relentlessly the changing sources of public school leadership, using the careers of a variety of educationists and school people to explore the processes of shaping, changing, promoting, campaigning for and influencing the public

school system. The importance of the book was in what it combined — life histories with a penetration of the conceptual and ideological processes in which they were engaged, the grand design with the adversarial situation, the individual commitment of a Catharine Beecher or an Ella Flagg Young with the gains and losses of wider battles.[52]

The second volume of Cremin's *American Education* was peopled similarly, but the overall combination of processes operated on a far wider canvas than that of Tyack and Hansot, and the busy stage had a different kind of impact. Cremin was in a sense, like some nineteenth-century predecessors, looking for 'representative' people. He found these for the most part at intermediate social levels, and they were present as cameos in what was essentially a treatment of ideas about education, seen 'not as disembodied notions in their own right or as mere rationalization of existential reality, but rather as moving forces that compete for attention and that profoundly influence what people believe is possible and desirable in the realm of education'.[53] Whether extending his net to incorporate the press and politics, religion and race, or social conditions of various kinds, Cremin was anxious to communicate a sense of the people engaged in the educational processes. He saw as the main characteristic of the nineteenth century, in fact, 'popularization and multitudinousness, in tandem', and in analyzing the nature of the institutions of education he emphasized 'increasing variety in the use made of these institutions, among different ethnic, religious, racial, geographic, and social groups, and between the sexes'.[54] Litwack's *Been in the Storm So Long* was a particularly vivid recapturing of the people involved in his 'aftermath of slavery' — slaves and teachers, missionaries, people black and white, alliances and conflicts, questions of freedom and schoolroom difficulties.[55] Cohen and Mohl, in their account of the Gary Plan, warned against monolithic portrayals of education and pressed the need to know more about those who fell through the cracks of the system, those who survived bureaucratic power, those who resisted.[56] One of the features of the early 1980s was the attempt to respond to such injunctions.

Approaches to education therefore responded to the complexities of explaining the sources and purposes of 'zeal', and the theme and many variations of Finkelstein's song. Responses were also of other kinds, and in some cases were reinterpretations of older approaches. The approach through institutional history was one such. A pair of histories of related and amalgamating schools, Abbott Academy and Phillips Academy, indicated how far institutional history had moved towards the main stream, with Lloyd's book on Abbott Academy, for instance, analyzing sensitively the roles of women in relation to the economy, the family and education, setting the school in its political and intellectual backgrounds. Mattingly argued the case for institutional history to take account of complex profes-

sionalization, to explain institutional change, to relate institutions to their broad cultural context, to account for the dissonance between policy and experience.[57]

Methodologies

New areas of interest produced related attention to the methodologies of appropriate research. This is as true of the aspects of history of education not discussed here — including the history of higher education and the history of black Americans — as of those we have considered. A discussion of the history of women and education would need to follow the leads of those historians who underlined the extent to which such a history is not just a history of women, but is concerned also with how men have defined women's lives and work.[58] Like other areas of research we have discussed, the essential interdisciplinarity of a historical answer to such a question as 'Why do women teach and men manage?' was being emphasized.[59] In the case of the education of blacks, of ethnic groups, of women, historians were still — as had been the case with revisionist historians — confronting areas of historical neglect or silence and either discovering ways of conducting a reinterpretation or searching for new avenues of understanding. In their work on the labour and radical past Altenbaugh, Leslie and Avrich all expressed surprise at the inattention of modern radicalism and libertarianism to their own historical roots. Goodenow and White and their contributors reconstructed *Education and the Rise of the New South*[60] with an eye to the unrecognized or ill-acknowledged elements of the Southern experience. Urban, in that collection, suggested a past failure of historians to attend to the opponents of reform as well to the reformers. Kaestle, in *Pillars of the Republic*, similarly indicated the need — reflected in the book — to portray nineteenth-century opponents of the common school sympathetically, in order to understand the narrowness of the common-school reformers' own ideology.[61] Finkelstein's work in general was an attack on aspects of historical silence, as were the contributions of a number of historians to Best's *Historical Inquiry in Education: A Research Agenda*, where Mattingly on institutions and Cohen on intellectual history deal specifically with the failure of historians to explain the process of change.

Much of the work discussed here was concerned explicitly with a search for more complex historical description, interpretation and judgment. The search operated at a variety of levels. The historians concerned with class formation, class conflict and the kaleidoscope of local coalitions and interactions deliberately escaped from what they saw as oversimple, single-cause explanations, finding it essential to test out grand assumptions

and patterns in the details of experience in different cities and communities. They were concerned not only with penetrating the complex detail, but also with understanding the complexities of class in historical terms — one of the great strengths of Katznelson and Weir's *Schooling for All* and Hogan's *Class and Reform*. In different ways historians were prepared to confront evidence and conflicting models of interpretation, in order to offer insights derived either from plural explanations or from new angles of vision.[62] Cremin, discussing family and school, church and newspaper; Tyack and James, discussing the differences amongst states in educational provision; Kaestle discussing conflict and change in regions; the contributors to Goodenow and White dissecting complex state differences, or to Goodenow and Ravitch looking at specific cases of change in urban schools and looking beyond the single case to interpretations — all of these were engaging with complex events and complex processes and explanations, and evading the oversimplified template of historical portrayal.

At another level, however, there was the complexity of the human case history, the biography, the social interaction, the response. Finkelstein is as concerned with the psychological and cultural as with the material aspects of urban educational history.[63] Berrol, disentangling the diversity of ethnic experience, concluded that generalization about 'Ethnicity and American children' is inappropriate.[64] The extension of the history of education to encompass wider processes of learning was by definition an exercise in complexity. Finkelstein's picture of children entering public school at the beginning of this century, for example, was a revealing one in this connection. On entering school

> they left behind a world of human relationships in which talking was the principal mode of discourse and in which the language of the Bible organized ideals and prescriptions. The talk was as likely to be Polish, Yiddish, Italian, or Slavic as it was to be English... The Bibles ... provided a basic core of allusion, fable, and sentiment. Communication between adults and children may have proceeded in households, in workplaces, on the streets, in churches and synagogues, or in stores...[65]

Mapping and analyzing those territories of discourse, learning and education, with their attendant considerations of class and gender, the school and the market place, are complex tasks — seen by some historians as supplementing organizing theories and concepts, and by others as competing with them. Complexities of these kinds were seen by some — for example, some of the reviewers of Cremin's work — as diverting attention from the 'central' issues (in some cases perceived as schooling, in others as the realities of social class relations). Urban, in his presidential address to the

US History of Education Society in 1980, confronted the objection that complex history subtly supports the *status quo*. That objection

> points to the very real way in which the study of history leads away from facilely optimistic views of social change ... the good society, like a good history, is not obtained easily...[66]

The argument clearly holds with regard to facile pessimism as well as optimism, and one of the features of American history of education in this period — the diversity and range of its directions and methodologies — pointed to an underlying dissatisfaction with some aspects of the over-simplified history of education and its organizing concepts of previous decades.

It is easy for historians, especially in texts for student or popular consumption, to respond to new situations simply by extending old agendas. In the fifth edition of a general textbook Rippa, for example, added sections on educational provision for women and racial equality, recent legal issues, and the education of American Indians and migrant children, but did not respond to the vigorous and controversial scholarships which had surrounded the organizing concepts important to historians in recent years.[67] An essential point about the increased range and directions of research from the late 1970s was its self-conscious concern with its own methodology. In some ways this concern was a function not only of the dilemmas of educational history itself, but also of the status of education and its history in an increasingly conservative and hostile environment. History of education needed to extend into other historical territories in part in order to attract some of their legitimacy — in the case of education and urban history for example.[68] Whatever the motives, however, the relationship between educational history and other branches of history had become a powerful feature of American historical writing. In terms of urban history, for example, some of the most significant writing of the 1970s benefitted from the struggle to establish the nature and interpretation of the connection — whether across a broad canvas in Tyack's *The One Best System*, or in the specific cases of Boston in Schultz's *The Culture Factory* or St Louis in Troen's *The Public and the Schools*. In the 1980s the same became true of women's education, and Tyack drew on the widespread issues in debates about the nature of the relationship between the law and education to point towards a social history of the law and public education.[69]

It is social history which from the 1960s provided the main context and reference point for historians extending the educational frontiers — and much of the work in the border areas of education and family history, education and community or class has to be seen in that light. The impact

of the early revisionist critiques by Bailyn and Cremin was substantially to drive educational history in the direction of social history (and Cremin's own later work has sometimes been seen as social history containing education rather than history of education incorporating features of social history). Social history is itself not monolithic, and has diversified methodologically under the influences of, for instance, the rapid developments of demographic or quantitative research. For some historians social history came to mean the history of social structures, and an interpretation by Katz and Hogan was made entirely in those terms.[70] A quantitative approach to social structure was, in fact, becoming a major contributor to the history of education, by bringing more sharply into focus a detailed picture of school experience across time and space — illuminating the processes of educational change in equations with industrialization or urbanization, differentiating regularity or length of school attendance by age and sex, class and ethnicity, family size or residential district. The new quantitative approaches were not absorbed easily into the community of educational, as of other, historians. Angus pointedly commented that 'many historians remain content to focus their attention on what Americans have *said* about their educational institutions rather than on how those institutions have actually functioned in the social order'.[71] The most successful attempt to overcome this duality — and not accepting the implication that what is said and thought is of a lower order than what 'actually functions' — was Kaestle and Vinovskis' *Education and Social Change in Nineteenth-Century Massachusetts*, which set out to test a number of hypotheses about nineteenth-century education by using quantifiable and other forms of analysis and explanation. At the heart of their enterprise was the question of establishing what reliance could be placed on such historical categories as urbanization and industrialization, searching for local patterns and variations. An analysis of an attempt in 1840 to abolish the Board of Education in the state assembled over a hundred variables for each of the 519 members of the House of Representatives in order to test whether party, occupation and various constituency characteristics most affected support for or opposition to state-wide educational development and control. On the basis of all of these approaches the authors rejected other pictures of a benign, democratic educational system opposed only by 'religious dissidents, bumpkins, and aristocrats', but they also rejected the narrow focus of some recent historians on 'human exploitation in our economic system as the chief generator of public school development'.[72]

What the attention to social class signalled was a renewed, if different, interest in the political history of education, the most direct concern with which was Katznelson and Weir's *Schooling for All*. The strengths of the book's political analysis lay in the pursuit of a detailed social geography

of ethnic, racial and class activities and relationships, a sense of the processes of political alignment. The very intention, however, revealed one of the weaknesses — the distancing of the analysis from the dramatis personae that some of the recent history of education had brought on stage. It attempted, in fact, to condemn scholars of education who had focussed too narrowly on 'questions of secondary importance and ... short-term changes rather than ... more basic trends'.[73] One of the difficulties of writing the political story of struggle around schools is the problem of retaining the schools themselves in the picture. Concern with the detailed problems of political 'reform' or the 'democratic ideal' of the sub-title took the effort in this case into the 'basic trends' of political processes, and away from the very nature of educational and social experience — much as the history of thinking about the curriculum sometimes eliminates the curriculum itself from the discussion. Katznelson and Weir's work — like that of Hogan and Peterson — was nevertheless, a significant contribution along new lines to the interpretation of education, and pointed towards a new form of dialogue between the political and social histories of education.

A wide variety of contributions to the literature in this period continued to underline the importance to American historiographic concerns of directly confronting the problems of ideology and of the organizing concepts in which historical explanations are couched. At the same time there was evidence of sustained engagement with the relationships between those concerns and detailed considerations regarding the historian's craft. Earlier revisionist approaches to education were debated at the level of their ideological commitments, but also at the level of the accuracy of their scholarship. The evidence supporting influential explanations by Katz or Bowles and Gintis was reexamined and found deficient. Reinterpretations — including of such theses as that of Callahan, or of individual educational records, such as those of Horace Mann Bond or Margaret Haley — were coupled with close readings of historical texts and documents. Standard assumptions about the relationships between processes — including the establishment and growth of mass education, cities and industries — were the object of diverse and detailed scrutiny. The reexamination of the Callahan thesis was itself part of a process — of which the Katznelson and Weir analysis was another example — of interpretations across longer time-spans. Meyer and colleagues likewise, looking at the processes of bureaucratization and centralization since 1940, concluded that the events of the period 1940–80 could not be explained in terms of that period alone:

> Too much attention is directed to the period of legal and rhetorical excitement associated with a new phase of bureaucratization and

> too little on the longer organizational process... What we found ... looks more like the continuation of changes resulting from earlier reforms and longer trends...[74]

In their approaches to the personal and personality, leadership and grass-roots, historians came closer to rejecting either-or explanations. The biographical and the local came closer to analysis in terms of race or gender or class. Alternative explanations and uncertainties were more countenanced. The 1980s were seeing competing histories with bases, in the case of Cremin for example, in a complex liberal vision, and in those of Hogan and others in a radical historiography drawn in part from European Marxist energies. The history was being pulled towards sober treatments of the policies and experiences of the more distant and the recent past. It also engaged — outstandingly in the cases of Tyack and Hansot pointing towards sources of confidence in public schooling, and Tyack, Lowe and Hansot suggesting the bases of long-term school stability[75] — in the difficult exercise of relating history to judgment in hard times. This is a long-way from the imprisoning 'presentism' against which revisionist historians warned, carried its own dangers, and indicated pluralist approaches to the relationship between history and 'other forms of inquiry'.

How diverse this operation in the early 1980s was is seen in the range of commitments, directions and strategies in Best's 'research agenda', *Historical Inquiry in Education*. Best, reflecting on the contributions to this volume, drew attention to the constant need historians feel to look at the history 'one more time'.[76] What Curti discussed in 1935 in terms of competing interpretations of 'zeal' and its motivation continued to be a portrait of historical scholarship in the field of American education. Curti saw the need, as did many historians of the 1960s and 1970s, to recognize a neglected area of political and economic analysis, to retreat from dominant explanations told in the language of idealistic motives — which, he reminded, 'were of course also operative'. American historians had not stopped the pursuit of his questions — whose zeal, for what purposes, to perpetuate and change what, and how now remembered and explained? Mapping and explaining educational change remained a difficult, and controversial, exercise.

This period of 1980s historical scholarship in education serves as an important reminder that, like any other form of social or political analysis, history means versions of history, may be radical or conservative, may be engaged in the confident pursuit of a reality or in reassessing the sources of confidence. Historians, social scientists, policy analysts, may tell 'truth to power', but there is no monopoly of the truth to be told.

Notes

1 CURTI, M. (1935) *The Social Ideas of American Educators*, Scribner's, 1959 edn, p. 85.

2 CREMIN, L.A. (1980) *American Education: The National Experience 1783–1876*, New York, Harper & Row; LITWACK, L.F. (1979) *Been in the Storm So Long: The Aftermath of Slavery*, New York, Knopf; WALZER, M. (1980) *Radical Principles: Reflections of an Unreconstructed Democrat*, New York, Basic Books.

3 COHEN, S. (1984) 'Reconstructing the history of urban education in America' in GRACE, G.R. (Ed.) *Education and the City: Theory, History and Contemporary Practice*, Boston, MA, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

4 COHEN, S. (1983) 'The school and personality development: Intellectual history' in BEST, J.H. (Ed.) *Historical Inquiry in Education: A Research Agenda*, Washington, DC, American Educational Research Association.

5 PETERSON, P.E. (1985) *The Politics of School Reform 1870–1940*, Chicago, IL, University of Chicago Press; KATZNELSON, I. and WEIR, M. (1985) *Schooling for All: Class, Race, and the Decline of the Democratic Ideal*, New York, Basic Books.

6 HOGAN, D.J. (1985) *Class and Reform: School and Society in Chicago 1880–1930*, Philadelphia, PA, University of Pennsylvania Press; KATZNELSON I. and WEIR, M. (1985) *op cit*.

7 WEISS, B.J. (Ed.) (1982) *American Education and the European Immigrant: 1840–1940*, Urbana, IL, University of Illinois Press.

8 TYACK, D. and MITCHELL, T. (1982) review of Cremin 'American Education: The National Experience', *American Journal of Education*, 90, 2, p. 177.

9 HOGAN, D.J. (1985) *op cit*., p. 230.

10 BERMAN, B. (1983) 'Business efficiency, American schooling, and the public school superintendency: A reconsideration of the Callahan thesis', *History of Education Quarterly*, 23, 3.

11 COHEN, R.D. and MOHL, R.A. (1979) *The Paradox of Progressive Education: The Gary Plan and Urban Schooling*, Port Washington, Kennikat Press; HOGAN, D. (1985) *op cit*; PETERSON, P.E. (1985) *op cit*; PLANK, D.N. and PETERSON, P.E. (1983) 'Does urban reform imply class conflict? The case of Atlanta's schools', *History of Education Quarterly*, 23, 2.

12 SHAPIRO, M.S. (1983) *Child's Garden: The Kindergarten Movement from Froebel to Dewey*, University Park, PA, Pennsylvania State University Press; KAESTLE, C.F. (1983) *Pillars of the Republic: Common Schools and American Society, 1780–1860*, New York, Hill and Wang.

13 BRENZEL, B.M. (1983) *Daughters of the State: A Social Portrait of the First Reform School for Girls in North America, 1856–1905*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press; REESE, W.J. (1986) *Power and the Promise of School Reform: Grass-roots Movements During the Progressive Era*, Boston, MA, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

14 BRENZEL, B.M. (1983) *op cit*, p. 166.

15 ROTHMAN, D.J. (1980) *Conscience and Convenience: The Asylum and its Alternatives in Progressive America*, Boston, MA, Little, Brown.

16 GRUBB, W.N. and LAZERSON, M. (1982) *Broken Promises: How Americans Fail Their Children*, New York, Basic Books; WIRTH, A.G. (1983) *Productive*

Work — in Industry and Schools. Becoming Persons Again, Lanham, University Press of America.

17 URBAN, W.J. (1982) *Why Teachers Organized*, Detroit, MI, Wayne State University Press; REID, R.L. (Ed.) (1982) *Battleground: The Autobiography of Margaret A. Haley*, Urbana, IL, University of Illinois Press.

18 ARNOVE, R.F. (Ed.) (1980) *Philanthropy and Cultural Imperialism: The Foundations at Home and Abroad*, Boston, MA, G.K. Hall.

19 *ibid.*, p. 1.

20 DARKNELL, F.A. 'The Carnegie philanthropy and private corporate influence on higher education', in *ibid.*, p. 387.

21 LAGEMANN, E.C. (1983) *Private Power for the Public Good: A History of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching*, Middletown, Wesleyan University Press.

22 NASAW, D. (1979) *Schooled to Order: A Social History of Public Schooling in the United States*, New York, Oxford University Press.

23 *ibid.*, p. 242.

24 KAESTLE, C.F. and VINOVSKIS, M.A. (1980) *Education and Social Change in Nineteenth-Century Massachusetts*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, p. 43.

25 FINKELSTEIN, B. (1985) 'Casting networks of good influence: The reconstruction of childhood in the United States' in HAWES, J.M. and HINER, N.R. (Eds), *American Childhood: A Research Guide and Historical Handbook*, Westport, CT, Greenwood Press.

26 GINSBURG, R., PETERSON, P. and PETERSON, C. (1983) 'Rethinking early twentieth century reform: The 1917 Illinois compromise', *Issues in Education*, 1, 2/3, pp. 107 and 128.

27 HOGAN, D.J. (1985) *op cit*, p. 135.

28 CLOWSE, B.B. (1981) *Brainpower for the Cold War: The Sputnik Crisis and the National Defense Education Act of 1958*, Westport, CT, Greenwood Press.

29 GRAHAM, H.D. (1984) *The Uncertain Triumph: Federal Education Policy in the Kennedy and Johnson Years*, Chapel Hill, NC, University of North Carolina Press.

30 KAESTLE, C.F. and SMITH, S. (1982) 'The federal role in elementary and secondary education, 1940–1980', *Harvard Educational Review*, 52, 4.

31 PRUCHA, F.P. (1979) *The Churches and the Indian Schools 1882–1912*, Lincoln, NB, University of Nebraska Press.

32 GRUBB, W.N. and LAZERSON, M. (1982) *op cit*.

33 TYACK, D. and JAMES, T. (1986) 'State government and American public education: Exploring the "primeval forest"', *History of Education Quarterly*, 26, 1.

34 ROTHMAN, O.J. (1980) *op cit*.

35 RAVITCH, D. (1983) *The Troubled Crusade: American Education, 1945–1980*, New York, Basic Books.

36 RESNICK, D.P. (1984) 'Educational policy and the applied historian: Testing, competency and standards', *Journal of Social History*, 14, 4.

37 HANSOT, E. and TYACK, D.B. (1982) 'A usable past: Using history in educational policy' in LIEBERMAN, A and MCLAUGHLIN, M.W. (Eds) *Policy Making in Education*, Chicago, IL, National Society for the Study of Education.

38 WARREN, D. (1983) 'The federal interest: Politics and policy study' in BEST, J.H. (Ed.) *op cit*, p. 175.

39 RESNICK, D.P. and RESNICK, L.B. (1977) 'The nature of literacy: An historical explanation', *Harvard Educational Review*, 47, 3.

40 GRAFF, H.J. (1979) *The Literacy Myth: Literacy and Social Structure in the Nineteenth-century City*, New York, Academic Press; GRAFF, H.J. (1983) 'Literacy and social development in North America: On ideology and history' in STEPHENS, W.B. (Ed.) *Studies in the History of Literacy: England and North America*, Leeds, Museum of the History of Education, p. 82.

41 SOLTOW, L. and STEVENS, E. (1981) *The Rise of Literacy and the Common School in the United States: A Socioeconomic Analysis to 1870*, Chicago, IL, University of Chicago Press, p. 193.

42 KAESTLE, C.F. (1985) *The History of Literacy and the History of Readers*, Madison, WI, Wisconsin Center for Education Research, mimeo.

43 REESE, W.J. (1986) *op cit*.

44 ALTENBAUGH, R.J. (1983) '"The children and the instruments of a militant labour progressivism": Brookwood Labor College and the American Labor College movement of the 1920s and 1930s', *History of Education Quarterly*, 23, 4; LESLIE, B.W. (1984) 'Coming of age in urban America: The socialist alternative, 1901–1920', *Teachers College Record*, 85; AVRICH, P. (1980) *The Modern School Movement: Anarchism and Education in the United States*, Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press.

45 KLIEBARD, H.M. and FRANKLIN, B.M. (1986) 'The course of the course of study: History of curriculum' in BEST, J.H. (Ed.) *op cit*; KLIEBARD, H.M. (1986) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum 1893–1958*, Boston, MA, Routledge & Kegan Paul; FRANKLIN, B.M. (1986) *Building the American Community: The School Curriculum and the Search for Social Control*, Lewes, Falmer Press, 1986.

46 CUBAN, L. (1982) 'Enduring resiliency: Enacting and implementing federal vocational education legislation, in KANTOR, H. and TYACK, D.B. (Eds) *Work, Youth, and Schooling: Historical Perspectives on Vocationalism in American Education*, Stanford, CA, Stanford University Press; LAZERSON, M. *et al.* (1985) *An Education of Value: The Purposes and Practices of Schools*, Cambridge, MA, Cambridge University Press.

47 FINKELSTEIN, B. (1983) 'Re-imagining educational reform: Public schools and the nurture of consciousness', *Educational Studies*, 14, 2, pp. 103–4.

48 STRICKLAND, C. and AMBROSE, A.M. (1985) 'The baby boom, prosperity, and the changing worlds of children, 1945–1963' in HAWES J.M. and HINER, N.R. (Eds) *op cit*; CLIFFORD, G.J. (1983) 'The life story: Biographic study' in BEST, J.H. (Ed.) *op cit*; COHEN, S. (1983) 'The mental hygiene movement', *History of Education Quarterly*, 23, 2. COHEN, S. (1983) *op cit*.

49 CUBAN, L. (1984) *How Teachers Taught: Constancy and Change in American Classrooms 1890–1980*, New York, Longman.

50 KAESTLE, C.F. (1982) 'Ideology and American history', *History of Education Quarterly*, 22, 2, p. 123.

51 DYER, T. (Ed) *To Raise Myself a Little*, ATHENS, GA, University of Georgia Press; BRENZEL, B.M. (1983) *op cit*.

52 TYACK, D. and HANSOT, E. (1983) *Managers of Virtue: Public School Leadership in America, 1820–1980*, New York, Basic Books.

53 CREMIN, L. (1980) *op cit*, p. x.

54 *ibid.*, pp. 483 and 485.

55 LITWACK, L.F. (1979) *op cit*.

56 COHEN, R.D. and MOHL, R.A. (1979) *op cit*.

57 MCINTOSH LLOYD, S. (1979) *A Singular School: Abbott Academy 1828–1973*, Andover, Phillips Academy; ALLIS JR. F.S. (1979) *Youth from Every Quarter: A Bicentennial History of Phillips Academy*, Andover, Phillips Academy; MATTINGLY, P.H. (1983) 'Structures over time: Institutional history' in BEST, J.H. (Ed.) *op cit*.

58 LAGEMANN, E.C. (1983) 'Looking at gender: Women's history' in BEST, J.H. (Ed.) *op cit*; MCINTOSH LLOYD, S. (1979) *op cit*, pp. 9–10.

59 STROBER, M.H. and TYACK, D. (1980) 'Why do women teach and men manage? A report on research in schools', *Signs*, 5, 3.

60 GOODENOW, R.K. and WHITE, A.O. (Eds) (1981) *Education and the New South*, Boston, MA, G.K. Hall.

61 URBAN, W. (1981) 'History of education: A southern exposure', *History of Education Quarterly*, 21, 2, pp. 134–43; URBAN, W. (1981) Teacher unionism and racial politics', in GOODENOW, R.K. and WHITE, A.O. (Eds) *op cit*, p. 128; KAESTLE, C.F. (1983) *op cit*, p. 223.

62 KATZNELSON I. and WEIR, M. (1985) *op cit*, pp. 91–103; SCHLOSSMAN, S. (1981) 'Philanthropy and the gospel of schild development', *History of Education Quarterly*, 21, 3, pp. 295–7; ROTHMAN, D.J. (1983) 'Social control: The uses and abuses of the concept in the history of incarceration' in COHEN, S. and SCULL, A. (Eds) *Social Control and the State*, Oxford, Robertson.

63 FINKELSTEIN, B. (forthcoming) 'Redoing urban educational history' in GOODENOW, R.K. and MARSDEN, W. (Eds) *Urban Educational History in Four Nations: The United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, and Canada*, New York, Holmes and Meier.

64 BERROL, S. (1985) 'Ethnicity and American children' in HAWES, J.M. and HINER, N.R. (Eds) *op cit*, pp. 352–3.

65 FINKELSTEIN, B. (1983) *op cit*, pp. 106–7.

66 URBAN, W.J. (1981) *op cit*, p. 143.

67 RIPPA, S.A. (1984) *Education in a Free Society: An American History*, 5th edn, New York, Longman.

68 SANDERS, J. (1983) 'Education and the city: Urban community study', in BEST, J.H. (Ed.) *op cit*.

69 TYACK, D. (1986) 'Toward a social history of law and public education' in KIRP, D.L. and JENSEN, D.N. (Eds) *School Days, Rule Days: The Legalization and Regulation of Education*, Lewes, Falmer Press.

70 KATZ, M.B. and HOGAN, D. (1983) 'Schools, work and family life: Social history' in BEST, J.H. (Ed.) *op cit*.

71 ANGUS, D.L. (1983) 'The empirical mode: Quantitative history' in BEST, J.H. (Ed.) (op cit) p. 76.

72 KAESTLE, C.F. and VINOVSKIS, M.A. (1980) *op cit*, p. 23.

73 KATZNELSON, I. and WEIR, M. (1985) *op cit*, p. 210.

74 MEYER, J.W. *et al.* (1985) *Bureaucratization Without Centralization: Changes in the Organizational System of American Public Education, 1940–1980*, Stanford, CA, Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance, mimeo, p. 7.

75 TYACK, D. and HANSOT, E. (1983) *op cit*; TYACK, D., LOWE, R. and HANSOT, E. (1984) *Public Schools in Hard Times: The Great Depression and Recent Years*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.

76 BEST, J.H. (Ed.) (1983) *op cit*, p. 2.

Chapter 9

Socially Disadvantaged Children in School, 1920–80

One of the historian's difficult roles is to trace the process by which vocabularies come to express or to conceal realities. Historians are themselves subject to the tyranny of vocabularies, but may help to liberate from them. Whether employing, confronting or attempting to evade concepts and their vocabularies, the work of the historian is shaped by them. Historical processes are expressed in terms of democracy or bureaucracy, social class or poverty, privilege or disadvantage, radicalism or conservatism — all, as countless others lost or still active in contemporary consciousness, protean across time. Disentangling historical processes is inseparable from plotting the changing vocabularies which represent them.

'Disadvantaged children in school' as a description contains multiple difficulties, given the problems relating to the historiographies of all three components and their relationships to one another. In twentieth century terms social disadvantage has overlapping synonyms and euphemisms; amongst the complexities of poverty and class, deprivation and underprivilege, its entrances and exits — like those of all such concepts — have to be located in the particularities of time and place. What this chapter attempts to do is consider the particular itineraries of the concept of socially disadvantaged children in school settings in Britain, and to some extent in the United States, from the 1920s, and then return to some historiographic and theoretical issues in the light of the analysis.

One initial and pervasive problem is the fact that 'children in school' are not just 'actors' and 'acted upon' in the school setting. They are elements in educational and social policy, members of other interlocking social institutions, legatees of cultural traditions of which schools are just one part. They are cloaked in the unstable and elusive vocabularies of social analysts, policy and judgment makers of many kinds. The disadvantaged are not just in education, they are in families and welfare systems, urban and rural environments, and many other categorizations — all of

which affect the understanding, even the definition, of educational processes. The disadvantaged are divisible by age, race, gender, ethnicity and the many typologies of sociologists, economists and others. All of these realities and representations have their different and related historical entrances and exits. All of them, whatever characteristics they share historically, are also nation-specific.

In Britain in the 1920s and 1930s the disadvantage-children-school relationship came to be expressed in terms of a confused amalgam of poverty and class, a conceptual diagram framed by a simple economics, an even simpler sociology, a buoyant psychology, and the specifics of a strengthening radical politics and of educational policy directions. As a result of the divided educational system inherited from the nineteenth century, and modified by limited opportunities to climb scholarship ladders, children of the poor were confined to short-duration, low expectation, dead-end elementary school experience, one which Tawney compared to an Indian rope trick, reaching to nowhere.[1] Revolutions or reforms in pedagogy, classroom organization or curricula had wide but uncertain impacts on nursery and elementary school provision, but even while affecting attitudes and approaches, such changes did not alter the basic pattern of children's education. Poor children were in general receiving some nine years of elementary schooling, with opportunities for only a few to transfer to the longer-term, wider opportunity 'secondary' system. What the 1920s and 1930s witnessed was an accumulating attack on the political, social and educational underpinnings of the concept of a relatively self-contained system of elementary schooling. The attack came from a variety of directions. The whole concept of separate educational systems was attacked as divisive, unfair and unwise.[2] It was economically and socially 'wasteful'.[3] Selection for secondary schooling was inaccurate.[4] In terms of human potential, justice, manpower training, it was profoundly inefficient. Policies for modification and reconstruction multiplied. An often ambiguous but politically vibrant emphasis on 'Secondary education for all',[5] together with the implications for fees, maintenance and structures, became an increasingly prominent policy formulation by the Labour Party and others. Equations began to be more firmly established between poverty and school failure. Explanations were sought in environment and child care, the nature of, and influences on, intelligence.

The particular relationships amongst environment, motivation, ability, achievement and opportunity received widening attention, and in the economic and social conditions of Britain between the wars, there is no difficulty in understanding the close interest developing in poverty and environment, and how these translated into children's educational experiences and life chances. In 1933 the influential Hadow Committee, reporting on infant and nursery schools, contained an undercurrent of reference

to poor housing and other aspects of the environment, the lack of stimulus for children in urban conditions, and the need for public authorities to accept the obligation to provide nursery schooling below the age of 5 in districts with overcrowding, 'unsatisfactory environments' and poor economic conditions.[6] What emerged was a closely argued relationship between the psychology of learning and school on the one hand, and policies for educational and social renewal on the other hand. One of the points of intersection was a conception of the consequences of environmentally deprived childhood, a conception which derived to a large extent from the mental deficiency models prevalent in the growing fields of child psychology and child guidance. Cyril Burt, in a path breaking study of 'educational backwardness', related it to poverty, while emphasizing that poverty did not result in 'stupidity'. Burt looked for the causes of backwardness outside the school, and considered in detail the effects of poverty, limited home and neighbourhood conditions.[7]

While Burt's and others' analyses of the nature and derivation of disadvantage were contained within models of the causes and remediation of mental deficiency, parallel, more directly sociological studies were beginning to explore particularly the relationships between school provision and children's attainment, and the distribution of differential incomes and social conditions. Some of the studies were based on simple models of social class. All saw the system of schooling as channelling children from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds through to the educational and social opportunities available, with all the resultant injustice and 'waste' of talent and human resources.[8] Child health and welfare began to claim greater attention at the level of the primary school, as it had already done in the pioneering approaches to nursery education.[9]

The range of implications for the child in school that was to be increasingly prominent after the Second World War had not yet surfaced in any coherent way. The relationship between school and home, the curriculum implications, pedagogy, testing — were all on the agenda of discussion, but largely as marginal issues to the central one of the need to reform the structure of educational provision. The concept of 'educational disadvantage' had not yet arrived. Children in school were from poor families, were socially and economically deprived, were victims of the system, were in schools with different resources, quality of teachers and curricula... All were coming under scrutiny, were being researched, and were subject to policy debate. It is the politics and the policies of this situation that have primarily attracted the interest of historians — the Hadow Report of 1926 recommending the restructuring of education, the nature, purpose and uses of testing and selection procedures, the concept of intelligence, the dissemination of progressive ideologies and practices. There is autobiographical and anecdotal evidence of schooling in the

period, but there is no social history of the experience of elementary schooling.

The Second World War proved to be an interregnum in attempts to analyze the relationships between poverty and education. The educational implications of social disadvantage more or less disappeared from the educational agenda. Two contingent war-time preoccupations were, however, of importance. The first was the impact of evacuation at the outbreak of war. When children were decanted from slums and near-slums to safer areas, the other England discovered that there existed living conditions and ways of life 'of a squalor and sordidness almost beyond... belief'.[10] A Mass Observation study, *War Begins at Home* in 1940, reported, as did other studies, what it titled 'atrocity stories' — the condition and behaviour of evacuees.[11] Here, however, and in other accounts of evacuation, there was little or no mention of the relationship between this discovery of poverty and children's schooling.[12] Implicit in that discovery, however, and in the second war-time preoccupation — planning for a unified structure of education — was a sense that what was needed was an 'onslaught on poverty',[13] and that the concept of secondary education for all, and a higher compulsory school leaving age, were important elements in the emergent pattern of post-war planning.

In the late 1940s and 1950s, with the implementation of welfare state policies and the 1944 Education Act, children — in and out of school — became a new focus of legislation, research, policy and planning. The dominant focus was secondary schooling, including pressures for a 'comprehensive school' solution. The emphasis was massively on structures, building, resources and the benefits and support services to enable children from poor families to benefit. The literature of the comprehensive school from the 1950s is dominated by the vocabulary of social class, exploring from various directions the purpose and intentions of secondary schools — whether divided or comprehensive — and the success or failure of the new levels of provision in overcoming the obstacles of social class. Initially, the interest in the comprehensive school was in its efficiency — did it enable children who would otherwise have been 'unselected' to benefit from the common school? Were examination results better than those in the non-selective 'secondary modern' school? Gradually, from the late 1950s, interest widened to the peer relations and academic experience of pupils in the comprehensive school, and especially the social composition of 'streams' within the comprehensive school. Not until the mid-1960s did the curriculum become a major issue (nor, until after the election of a Labour government in 1964 did the comprehensive solution become firm government policy).

The emphasis on social class and the secondary school, together with optimistic views of the disappearance of poverty under the impact of the

welfare state and an increasingly affluent society, concealed other concerns that pointed towards the continuing need to address issues relating to children from disadvantaged backgrounds in school. Post war pressures for an expansion of nursery education were predicated on its importance both for 'deprived' children and for all children — a continuing tension in the nursery school movement. A rapidly growing interest in 'remedial' education for the educationally disadvantaged — which commonly meant socially disadvantaged — was being given official endorsement, for example in the 1959 Ministry *Handbook of Suggestions for the Primary School*.[14] Throughout the 1940s and 1950s there were flurries of interest in the relationship between the school and home and neighbourhood, and the impact of that relationship on, for example, reading performance.[15] The focus on testing and selection for the secondary school, under attack increasingly from left-wing critics such as Brian Simon and Max Morris, was also coming under fire from prominent psychologists.[16] One of the first visible interests in a move from simple remedial provision to a wider sense of what came to be known in the 1960s as 'compensatory education', particularly in the United States, came from educational psychologist W.D. Wall, who in 1959 was arguing that it was important to be aware of deficiencies in children's environment, and to supply what the children lacked.[17] An implication of many of these developments, particularly those concerning testing at age 11, was that children in the primary school were being excessively subjected to preparation for the tests, and to streaming within the classroom as a result.[18]

Other interests in the pre-school and primary school age child took discussion of children's activities and performance in school also into the wider realm of health and welfare. In the post-war years research projects began to follow the development of babies and young children. An early study of children in Newcastle, for example, highlighted the relationship between poverty and children's illnesses — a study which, published in 1954, influenced the well-known work of the 1960s on the relationships between home and school.[19] Bowlby's dominant position in child care discussion in the 1950s, while focussing on the family and the vulnerability of children aged 3–5, underlined the fact that poverty did not mean neglect, and that social policy in general needed to take greater account of the economic weakness of families and its implications.[20] From the late 1950s Basil Bernstein was beginning to bring children's school performance, linguistic characteristics and home and other environments on to the agenda of research and debate.[21] It is important to establish the fact that in the 1950s these developments and traditions were of diverse kinds. The nursery school movement, on the one hand, was not a research-related, experimental tradition.The work of Kellmer Pringle, for example, on childhood deprivation was.[22] The work of Basil Bernstein and the

sociologically-grounded *Early Leaving* report[23] focussed on school and children's experience of schooling directly. Bowlby and subsequent researchers on child care did not. Winnicott in the 1950s and 1960s was arguing for a supporting home as necessary to the school, but was arguing against schools' ability to diagnose or to exploit their knowledge of children's family backgrounds.[24] School-home relationships across time as they affected children's position within school structures, and their attainment levels there, began to become public issues in the second half of the 1950s, and centrally so in the 1960s.

The most prominent sociological work of the 1950s and 1960s focussed on the relationship between class and educational structure, not on the precise workings of schools and the nature of children's experience there. The work that emanated from a largely demographic context at the London School of Economics, and became best known through the analysis of differential access to selective secondary education, was essentially a sociology of the politico-educational system. At an early stage Floud and Halsey pointed out that a sociology of the school was desperately needed.[25] The Newsom Report, *Half Our Future*, did indeed focus on descriptive studies of the environment and school experience of children in 'slum areas' — and with an eye to the causes of juvenile delinquency, J.B. Mays, also in the early 1960s, looked at schooling in poor urban settings.[26] With all the strengths and limitations of the medical context from which it sprang, Douglas's work on the home and the school brought together many of the research approaches pioneered in Newcastle, at the National Children's Bureau and elsewhere to produce an influential trend of explanation of the widening gap in school experience between working-class and middle-class children. Douglas and others who followed widened the picture of children in school as incorporating socially-determined characteristics resulting from patterns of pre-natal and post-natal parental behaviour, home conditions, and an increasingly diverse picture of the workings of social class.[27] What these studies, together with the explanations offered by Bernstein, and the attack by the Robbins Committee and others on the concept of a limited national 'pool of ability',[28] pointed to was a continuing failure by the educational system to provide large numbers of working-class children with the school experience and opportunities heralded by the rhetoric of the 1944 Act and post-war educational policy-making.

It was the Plowden Committee, reporting on *Children and Their Primary Schools* in 1967, that effectively brought the concept of the socially disadvantaged child firmly on to the educational agenda. The widely read and discussed report changed this agenda in several ways. For the first time since the war, it turned some of the priority attention away from the secondary school. In doing so it placed a new emphasis on the

educational experience of the younger child, in pre-school and primary school, and on the elements of educational experience at this level. As the system moved away from selective transition from primary to secondary school, and therefore away from streaming in the primary school, the report underlined the more informal components of primary schooling that could take precedence.[29] Secondly, it accepted the evidence on continuing poverty and its consequences for the primary school child, and it emphasized the environmental sources of early school failure. The Committee visited the United States to explore, among other things, the gathering momentum of American legislation and programmes arising from environmentalist theories and pointing towards solutions in 'compensatory education'. Although the Committee made little direct reference to the American experience in the report, its emphasis on the educational handicaps of the disadvantaged, particularly urban, child derived to an important extent from this growing attention to the 'disadvantaged child' and the research-based and other literature addressing the educational implications. Thirdly, the Committee commissioned a range of research — some of which, particularly regarding the confused area of the precedence of class or parental attitude,[30] proved controversial. It also visited schools and community projects, commissioned reports on inner-city schooling and for the first time as a national committee on education addressed issues of the schooling of immigrants and racial minorities. Fourthly, it proposed policies which would directly affect the school experience of children in what, after much discussion, it termed 'educational priority areas', in which — on the basis of indices of economic and social disadvantage — schools were to have 'positive discrimination'.[31] Although the earlier focus on the secondary school had identified issues relating to the working-class child penalized by existing structures, the Plowden discussion sharpened a focus on earlier pre-school and primary school forms of social and educational disadvantage.

From this point in the 1960s, therefore, the disadvantaged younger child became, for a decade or so, one of the prime targets of research, experiment and debate. Even before the Plowden Committee reported a 'compensatory education' research project was being designed in Swansea, aimed at identifying young school-age, disadvantaged children educationally 'at risk'.[32] In addition to urban aid strategies already in place, the Labour government adopted the 'priority areas' principle, and funds — more limited than the Plowden proponents considered necessary — were channelled into designated schools, to provide improved facilities or enriched experience for the children concerned. In EPA schools children found themselves, for example, with classroom auxiliaries and new equipment, and with transport to provide access to playing fields and the countryside. An EPA action research project in four English locations and

one in Scotland provoked an interest both during the projects and when the first reports began to appear in 1972 in a range of elements developed in the projects — curriculum change; parent involvement; new reading schemes; concerns for teacher morale; the roles of local authorities, businesses, community groups ... in collaboration with schools.[33] In addition to the descriptive literature that was appearing, and the research of various kinds that was attempting to fine-tune explanations of children's school performance, there were now developments which were attempting to bring together, at policy and other levels, the interests in schooling, community, family, politics and policy. A national Centre for the Study of Educational Disadvantage, based in Manchester, disseminated information about school initiatives and projects.[34] The 'community school', one of the central emphases of the EPA project reports, attracted wider national attention. Local authorities and others in various parts of Britain — including importantly in Scotland[35] — continued to invest in the processes which the EPAs had initiated. Community development and other programmes placed education in a wider policy context.

By the beginning of the 1970s the disadvantaged child in school was a focus of action, research, policy and controversy. The questions which had begun to surface, particularly in the United States but also in Britain, in the 1960s, assumed greater importance. Was the disadvantaged child being rescued or blamed? Was the disadvantaged child deficient or different? Did the explanations and strategies being evolved stem from middle-class values, and did they aim at more subtle forms of social control? The 1970s were to see extensive debates around concepts of culture, language, the family, knowledge and the curriculum, power, the state — and they all bore on the nature, opportunities and limitations of the disdvantaged child's school experience, and on the function of the school itself. The emergent focus was not so much the disadvantaged child as explanations of the role of schooling itself.[36]

It is worth taking a brief glance at the parallel, and at some points related, interest in the American disadvantaged child.

The beginnings of the American attack on the concept of 'fixed intelligence', and of research on the educability of the backward child also took place in the 1930s, led by the Child Welfare Research Station at the University of Iowa — research which was met with scepticism, if not hostility.[37] Here also the models of mental backwardness were dominant, and it was not to be until the 1960s that the disavantaged child was to be viewed from other directions. In the 1940s and 1950s the focus of attention for educational exploration and policy-making was elsewhere — encompassing the gifted child and vocational education, new teaching methods and the effects of educational expansion. The nursery school developments of the pre-war Depression did not carry over into post-war

208

priorities, as American confidence in the uninterrupted spread of affluence set aside any major concern with poverty and disadvantage. D.O. Hebb, in the 1940s, produced a developmental theory which, picked up, amplified and targeted by J. McVicker Hunt in the early 1960s, was to point to strategies for overcoming early environmental handicaps and what came to be called by a variety of names — including cultural deprivation and social and educational disadvantage. An influential conference on 'Pre-school enrichment of socially disadvantaged children' in 1962 reflected a rapidly growing interest in the environment, development and schooling of the disadvantaged child: Hunt himself published *Intelligence and Experience* at the beginning of the 1960s, and *The Challenge of Incompetence and Poverty: Papers on the Role of Early Education* at the end of the decade, presenting his influential work of the preceding years.[38] A major new departure had taken place in the analysis of early childhood, the influence of social conditions, and the educational and other strategies that could reverse the backwardness resulting from early environmental handicaps.

From 1960 the Ford Foundation was funding programmes and projects targeting the education of the disadvantaged child, particularly in urban areas subject to 'in-migration'. In the Kennedy years from 1961 federal attention and funding were directed to the causes of juvenile delinquency, and included community and educational projects. Johnson's War on Poverty was proclaimed in 1964 and was operational the next year with the beginnings of the Head Start pre-school program, other projects of the new Office of Economic Opportunity, and an Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1965 which specifically, in its Title I, targeted the children of the poor. Experimental projects with pre-school and early grade children were being rapidly developed from private, state and federal sources, and alongside — and sometimes seen as in competition with — the movement for school desegregation was a rapidly growing compensatory education movement encompassing all of these. Many of the Ford and other projects were directed at those inner cities which were receiving large numbers of black rural migrants, but these and others were also prompted by widespread white rural poverty, particularly in Appalachia. The problem of the deprived or disadvantaged child, coming out of what was — not without challenge — described as a 'culture of poverty', was the paramount educational issue of the mid- and late 1960s. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act required that schools receiving Title I funding should be identified by poverty indices, but that children to receive the additional attention within the schools should be identified on criteria of educational backwardness — it being commonly understood that such children were likely to be socially disadvantaged.[39]

The American educational literature of the 1960s, reflecting research,

208

conferences, journalistic interests in poverty and policy thrusts at every level, is massively concerned with issues which related to improving the educational experience and performance of the disadvantaged child: pre-schooling and the short-term and long-term effects, or lack of them; the training of teachers for work with the disadvantaged; 'enrichment' programmes; language and reading; the characteristics of the disadvantaged child... 'Disadvantaged' became one of the most familiar words in the titles of books on education,[40] and around it revolved widespread disputes about the intentions of compensatory education, policy choices, resources, and — as in Britain — the question of 'blame'. In much of the literature there is emphasis on the deficiencies of the poor home and environment, and since a significant percentage of the targeted population was black, it was castigated as racist by some critics. Much of the literature, however, directly attacks the schools as failing to understand the strengths of the disadvantaged child, failing to adapt traditional middle-class school processes to new school populations, and failing to use the opportunities provided by the new economic and social situation to relate adequately to the disadvantaged child and his or her family and community. Every new development in the fast changing policies, structures and practices of the mid-1960s 'liberal consensus', was to provoke a counter-attack at some stage. Evaluations of the success of the programmes in terms of children's cognitive and social development were conflicting. The Coleman Report seemed to suggest that school, in any case, mattered less than home.[41] Head Start, an immensely popular pre-school programme to bring disadvantaged children into the 'mainstream' was eventually to run into the criticism that while the rest of the educational system was attempting to desegregate, it was fostering a form of pre-school segregation.[42]

By the end of the 1960s the compensatory education movement had lost much of its public glamour but was well ensconced as a feature of school processes, state administration and federal policy. The shape, extent and funding of the programmes from public and private sources was in many forms to diminish as educational priorities moved in other directions. Disadvantaged children were to continue in substantial numbers to attend Head Start programmes, to receive supplementary curricular or other support through Title I (or, as it became in 1981, Chapter I), and to reappear from time to time as an item on the agendas of a variety of bodies concerned with minorities, social equity and civil rights, educational and economic efficiency.[43] The concept of 'disadvantage' and the strategies for countering it remained controversial. The experience of disadvantaged children in school was, particularly from the late 1960s, of direct interest to the rapidly growing process of evaluation. How to analyze, record, measure, judge, the effectiveness of programmes and the learning and development of children in school became a central feature not only of the

funding of such programmes (which commonly required some form of built-in evaluation), but also of professional life in the educational setting. Evaluation is itself a form of historical scholarship, for particular and perhaps applied purposes. Historians of children's experience of education will have data at their disposal for the 1960s and afterwards, which, for all their difficult and controversial features, are different from anything available for previous decades.

It is important to note that from the late 1960s, in particular, Britain and the United States exchanged messages about the education of the disadvantaged child in various ways, though often with a degree of hesitation and resistance.[44] The Americans were interested in the British 'open classroom', for example, and made considerable use (not without criticism) of the work of Bernstein. The Plowden Committee not only visited the US, but was reminded in evidence to it of the earlier work from Iowa, for example.[45] Under the auspices of the Ford Foundation in the US, the Ditchley Centre in Britain, and the OECD, discussions of respective research, policy and experience were held. As the 1970s moved on, however, attention in both countries was directed by economic and social events towards other educational objectives. The 'civic' missions of concern with poverty and disadvantage were increasingly replaced in the late 1970s especially by the 'economic' or 'business' missions of successful international competition, and the training of appropriately skilled manpower for new technologies and a changing world of work.[46] The policy priority, in both Britain and the US, turned to 'standards', 'excellence', and accompanying moves towards more vocational curricula and increased testing. In both countries from the late 1970s there was increased attention to problems of pupil disaffection and disruption, violence and dropping out, teenage pregnancy and other aspects of social malaise for which the schools were asked to find solutions.

In terms of research, it is interesting that in the 1980s new directions not only bypassed the focus on disadvantage, but explicitly appeared to eclipse it. The 'effective schools' research of the late 1970s and 1980s, in fact, began to focus on the school structures, processes and characteristics that enabled all children to benefit from schooling. In the US, criteria began to be elaborated — and to be disputed — by which schools could maximize the potential of all of their pupils, criteria relating to 'leadership', discipline, the teaching of basic skills, and so on.[47] In Britain, the focus on teaching styles which Bennett and others originated, and on the detailed characteristics of the effective secondary school emanating from the work of Rutter and colleagues, was only tangentially concerned with the disadvantaged child. In fact, as Mortimore and colleagues deduced from their work on the junior school, the disadvantaged child had most to gain, not from targeted programs, but from the identification of the nature

of the effective school.[48] It is worth noting also that French research in the 1980s, following the creation of the zones d'éducation prioritaires, claimed to find in strategies of collaborative learning amongst young children processes which overcame the distinctions of social class.[49] Whether the focus was on the child, the family, class, the school, policy or other socioeconomic realities, from the 1960s through to the late 1980s there were considerable zig-zags of attention, and widening ripples of interest in the schooling of either the disadvantaged child, or of the education of younger children — with an eye to the strategies of success with the disadvantaged. In the American context it has been suggested that in the history of schooling generally educational practice has been determined by economic, political and social considerations more than by what is good pedagogy to employ with children — with early childhood as an exception, which only lost its 'innocence' in the 1960s when it was pushed into the economic, political and social spotlight.[50]

Whatever the recent research on effective schools may suggest about non-targeted education, the American follow-up research on the Head Start and other pre-school programmes of the 1960s has offered significant evidence that the targeted programmes have had more of an impact than was earlier believed. On measures of college attendance, police records, teenage pregnancy and others the longitudinal studies suggest that disadvantaged children who attended pre-school programmes had long-run benefits over those who did not.[51] By the late 1980s in the United States especially the children of the poor or the newly-termed 'underclass', were receiving renewed attention.[52]

There is clearly no simple trajectory to describe and analyze for the concept of disadvantaged children or for the systems of schooling or the classroom processes they experience. Under a variety of external pressures the concept of disadvantage, what it is and how — or whether — to make special educational provision for it, alter, and become or cease to be part of a public agenda. Across the period we have discussed disadvantage has been psychological, economic, social and educational, and although the epithets inter-connect, the schooling responses differ according to the condition they are invited to address. The variety and implications of the concept are subject differentially across time to the impacts of research, experiment or political ideology. From the starting point of disadvantage, therefore, the focus may be on the pre-school child or the adolescent, school structures and procedures or the curriculum, universal or targeted policies, the teacher or the parent, the apparatus of testing and selection or family support, the guilt of the child, the family, the wider environment, the school, the educational system, the corporate state. Disadvantage and its synonyms relate back to divergent and elusive conceptions of class and culture, poverty and power.

Historically, therefore, the schooling of the disadvantaged child involves mapping alternative choices and realities, a process which is not immune from participation in the controversies surrounding, for example, the concepts of deficit and difference, or the relative merits of debating class or poverty — and the different implications to which each concept points. With an eye closely to the specifics, the historian finds that the concepts obtrude — as do the social science, political or other strategies which produce data and the models of understanding social processes with which the historian engages. One of the difficulties, of course, is the silence that also has to be understood. How, for example, in tracing the history of the concept of disadvantage and its relationship to schooling, is the absence of interest in the different school experience of boys and girls to be analyzed? From the *Early Leaving* Report of the 1950s to the Plowden Report of the 1960s, in the work on testing or the sociology of access to secondary and higher education, there was no serious separate interest in the education of girls as disadvantaged. Issues of that kind have more recently become central to the work of feminist historians. How, similarly, amidst contemporary debate about the relationships between race and educational policy and experience, is the period in Britain of the late 1950s through to the early 1970s to be analyzed? The Ford Foundation and subsequent developments in the US, including Head Start, were —' until the late 1960s — the subject of a profound public silence in Britain, even from those who were familiar with them, and at least part of the explanation is that the American problems being confronted had to do with 'race', while the British were concerned with 'immigration'. The argument eventually broke down, but the fact remains that until the late 1960s the education of black and other minorities was treated as marginal, to be handled 'inexplicitly'.[53] The relative silence until at least the late 1960s is matter for the historian as clearly as are the topics of priority public debate. Or, to take a third and final example, what interpretation is to be put on the fact that the Fabian Society, in its evidence to the Plowden Committee in the mid-1960s, talked about the needs of 'backward readers' and 'immigrants' (in terms of language), but made no reference whatever to poverty or disadvantage? In the written and oral evidence to which some leading socialists contributed, there was no apparent interest in the fact that continuing poverty had by that stage been a matter of major concern amongst a group of sociologists for some seven or eight years, that the Labour Party (and the Fabian Society itself) had made poverty a policy issue, and that disadvantaged children in the primary school were being widely shown to be the failures of the secondary school system.[54] If, at that point, 'backward reader' is presented as a term unrelated to class or disadvantage, what is to be made of the silence? Historians have to account for what choices are not made, what discourse

is avoided, what conceptual or vocabulary substitutions are made. By the nature of things, these are directions in which evidence is slight or non-existent, and in which the historian's guiding theories become most explicit.

Is the concept of disadvantage, then, a usable category? Are the motivations to single out the disadvantaged for 'treatment' (including by positive discrimination) those of help and benevolence, those of liberal or social-democratic welfare and justice, those of corporate or statist manpower planning needs, or those of social control and diversion from other political priorities? What the history of the disadvantaged child in school explains is that there is no one answer. The concept and the processes associated with it have multiple origins and multiple purposes. Attempts to bring the socially disadvantaged and perhaps educationally disadvantaged child into the 'mainstream culture', to meet the requirements of schooling, to succeed within it, are explicable in terms of contemporary economics and technology, as well as social-democratic, or socialist, policy. There are few pure motives in history.

What the historian can attempt to do is reveal the diversity of directions from which a concept such as the educational needs of the disadvantaged child comes; the conditions in which it assumes some public priority, who responds to it, when and why; the varieties of meanings and implementations it acquires in public discourse and policy; how it changes, is abandoned or replaced; its place as an alternative to other concepts and therefore other interpretations of reality. The historian is in that respect doing considerably more than describing a process, or even using an organizing concept. The very language of identifying the child as disadvantaged, or poor, or working-class, or deprived, or whatever, is a complex judgment at the intersection of specifics and theory.

'Disadvantaged child' brings the world into the classroom. All the vocabularies involved — control, middle-class values, success and failure . . . (and all the questions asked such as — what is the purpose of positive discrimination?. . .) enter the diverse realms and modes of sociopolitical theory. All the vocabularies of 'in school', similarly, enter the realms of educational and related theories including questions of structure, teacher role, effectiveness, assessment, expectations of and provision for children in general and in specific categories. The historical search for causes, explanations, the grouping of singular events into 'processes' is therefore symbiotically also theoretical. How difficult it is to represent these points of intersection and association is clear from long battles amongst historians, and in the Marxist historiography of the past two decades in particular. The danger for historians in approaching the sequences relating to a concept like the disadvantaged child lies in disregarding the theoretical niceties involved in understanding the social settings out of which the

concept arises. The danger for theorists is in accepting historical assertion as unproblematic, a danger that Bowles and Gintis, for example, were not able to circumvent in using what was then the recent, revisionist analyses in American educational historiography.[55] Historians are tempted towards the unsullied concept. Theory, especially in the sociopolitical world, is tempted towards monocausal historical explanations. One of the immediate outcomes of failing to reconcile some of these difficulties is the frequent transition from a liberating to an ossifying vocabulary of explanation, a vocabulary which may in time become anti-historical. The vocabularies of 'progress', 'modernization' and 'industrialization' have often become so in the past, and the vocabularies of 'social control', the 'corporate state' and 'hegemony' have run the same danger more recently. Looking for the points of transition from an illuminating vocabulary to one that may prevent historical insights is another of the historian's difficult roles.

The picture we have outlined across more than half a century is one in which the educational condition of children is governed by public policy and private dreams, orthodoxies and anti-orthodoxies, constancy and change in the classroom,[56] total system and individual psychology, the sociology and politics of the child and of the world he or she represents in school. The child is, therefore, at the centre of multiple diagrams surrounded by analyses in terms of cultural transmission or class replication, sorting mechanisms and socializing agencies. Policy, the politics of educational distribution (for example, selection and segregation) and of special provision (for example, compensatory education and educational priority areas), and everything that governs the processes of child development and learning, therefore penetrate the classroom. Why, then, in the account of the disadvantaged child in school across this period, is so little said about the *child*, as distinct from the educational *condition* of the child? It would be difficult to argue, for either Britain or the United States, that there exists a serious social history of the school, and even less so of children in school. The fragility of the reference to disadvantaged children themselves in our discussion here reflects the past and present difficulties of conducting an historical exercise in which the children appear as central actors in the story. The final question here must be to ask why.

Historians have the dual problem of what to investigate — and thereby defining their own discipline — and what to make of what they investigate — thereby defining their own theory and their own relationship to others' theories. In the history of education attention wanders to an extent which often makes the object of attention almost impossible to recognize. For example, in his three-volume history of *American Education*, and characteristically in the recent third volume, subtitled 'The Metropolitan Experience 1876–1980',[57] Lawrence Cremin set out with the

mission of redefining the very concept of 'education' to embrace an enormous range of social institutions which he considered to be educative, in addition to the narrowly-defined educational agencies of school or college. He explores the relationships amongst school and household, the work setting and the church, press and radio, and many more, and arrives at a model of 'education' which is roughly coextensive with 'culture'. So considerable, however, is the weight placed on the impact of, say, the journalist, the evangelist or the fundamentalist religious movement, that it is difficult to assess what value to place, or what value Cremin places, on the teacher and teacher education, the classroom and the lecture theatre. Counterbalance becomes overbalance to the point at which children and students disappear. Are the ways in which children actually experience schooling and these broader educational processes important in the history of education? If so, there are important and difficult questions to ask and judgments to make about their almost complete absence from this account of an American century, but also from vast amounts of other historical literature on American, British and other people's education. Roy Lowe, for example, has recently written, in Britain, *Education in the Post-War Years: A Social History*. What *is* a social history? The question becomes important when Lowe explains his purpose in the following terms:

> What I have attempted to write is a social history of education in the sense that it attempts to keep in view the relationships between the developing educational system and the changes that were taking place more generally in society. I have only a limited amount of material on what it meant and felt like to be educated during these years, and an account which is centred on that problem must await another author.[58]

What Lowe intends (and in fact does) differs from Cremin only in its candour. Lowe is not alone, however, in the history of education, or in social history, in making the assumption that a social history need not come to terms with what the experience of the process 'meant and felt like'. There is no doubt, of course, that social history has to be concerned with broad developments and relationships. Nor is there any doubt that the texture of educational experience is difficult to discern and research. The paradox remains, however. In 1977 an American publication entitled *200 Years of Children*[59] included in one section on 'A nation of learners' ten articles taken from another book of that name. In this book, about *children*, none of the ten articles is in any real sense about children — they are all about the system, schools, policies, campaigns for rights, teachers... The centre of the diagram seems to be missing.

The history of education, of course, infers children, and may be about

their age of admission to school, their attendance, numbers, retention, policies relating to girls or the children of minorities, or a host of other abstractions from the realities of children's presence in schools or elsewhere. Ten years of the British *History of Education* journal, for instance, illustrate many of these aspects of historical attention, but the overwhelming emphasis of the work published has been on policy and administration, provision, debate, organization, campaigns, institutions, curriculum, plans, the vicissitudes of systems, the conceptualization of control... Only three articles over that period seem to address children in school *directly*, one on reformatory and industrial schools, one on the education of working-class girls in the nineteenth century, and one on 'boys and girls at school, 1800–70'.[60] While other kinds of educational research have in the past decade moved increasingly towards a focus on the internal workings of schools, their component parts and relationships, the attention of historians has tended to wander among the wider issues of systems and institutions, and the grand designs of educational, social and political change.

There are, of course, exceptions, mainly in the United States, notably those which have come from the direction of the history of childhood, though even there the preoccupation with childhood, often in the context of psychohistory, has not necessarily led to linkages with the experience of children in school. Barbara Finkelstein has attempted to make those linkages, and in his work on the history of teachers in the classroom Larry Cuban illustrates how a focus on children's experience could also emerge.[61] In Britain there are glimpses of children in recent work by Margaret Bryant on secondary education in London, and by John Hurt in work on children 'outside the mainstream'.[62] What, however, does the paucity of such examples indicate? Is it that historians do not know about children, do not wish to know, or do not wish to admit that they do not know or do not wish to know? The answer is more complex. It has more to do with the kind of ultimate statement historians wish to make. In specific cases, such as social control historiography, as represented by, say Katz and Ignatieff, the effort itself is directed towards explaining how institutions impose upon, contain or manipulate the children (or inmates, or victims of one kind or another) and there is in such a case no *need* to focus on people as participants.[63] In general, however, and certainly in the British case, there is an absence of children primarily because the historical literature on education has been preoccupied with explaining the growth of a particular system, its origins, its embodiment in changing patterns of policy, governance, provision, institutions, justifications. If the purpose is to explain the role of education in, or as evolved by, a particular state machine, there is little need to bring children into the centre of the diagram.

Unlike Cremin, British educational historians have perceived the

educational story of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries as almost entirely one of institutions, conflicts of ideas and the details of distribution and the content of schooling — in terms of types of school, curriculum, examinations, teachers... To answer the question why there appear in these accounts to be no children learning, not even children as picaresque bandits in a landscape, it is necessary to construct a theory of this particular historical exercise, a theory which has to do with the historian's ultimately intended message and the perceived nature and purposes of the educational realities under scrutiny. We probably know more about the experience of children in school in medieval or seventeenth-century England than we do about children in school in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, given that the focus in the earlier periods is not on the state, systems and the abstractions of explanation of contemporary society, and given that the resources available to the historian are therefore of a different kind. That contrast helps to define and explain the problem.

Perhaps the central outcome of such an analysis is the knowledge that the role of the historian must not be oversimplified. Historical analysis may in various ways help to place concepts, abstractions, theories, under the changing spotlights where they need to be seen, but history is not discrete. It not only holds dialogue with theory, it shares theory. The complexities of the disadvantaged child in school are historical *and* theoretical.

Notes

1 Tawney, R.H. (1922) *Secondary Education for All*, London, Allen & Unwin, p. 26.
2 *ibid.*; Consultative Committee of the Board of Education (1926) *The Education of the Adolescent* (The Hadow Report), London, HMSO.
3 Lindsay, K. (1926) *Social Progress and Educational Waste*, London, Routledge.
4 Members of the West Yorkshire County Association of the National Union of Teachers and the West Riding Teachers' Association, having 'long doubted the reliability of the examinations usually employed to select pupils for secondary education of the grammar school type', the two bodies set up a joint committee in 1936 to investigate methods of selection, which reported in 1941 on the 'unreliability of the single opportunity'. Joint Committee (1941) *Special Place Examinations*, London, University of London Press, p. 58.
5 Tawney, R.H. (1922) *op cit*; Silver, H. (1980) *Education and the Social Condition*, London, Methuen, p. 23.
6 Consultative Committee of the Board of Education (1933) *Infant and Nursery Schools* (The Hadow Report), London, HMSO. See, for example, p. xxv.
7 Burt, C. (1937) *The Backward Child*, London, University of London Press, see particularly chapter 5.
8 Two good examples are Gray, J.L. (1936) *The Nation's Intelligence*, London,

Watts; and GRAY, J.L and MOSHINSKY P. (1938) 'Ability and opportunity in English education' in HOGBEN, L. (Ed.) *Political Arithmetic*, London, Allen & Unwin.

9 See, for example, PATON, G.M. (1915) *The Child and the Nation*, London, Student Christian Movement, for an early illustration. For a summary, see Department of Education and Science (1975) *The School Health Service 1908–1974*, London, HMSO.

10 DENT, H.C. (1944) *Education in Transition*, London, Kegan Paul, p. 8.

11 HARRISSON, T. and MADGE, C. (Eds) (1940) *War Begins at Home*, London, Chatto & Windus, p. 36.

12 In spite of its sub-title this is true of ISAACS, S. (Ed.) (1941) *The Cambridge Evacuation Survey: A Wartime Study in Social Welfare and Education*, London, Methuen.

13 Women's Group on Public Welfare (1943) *Our Towns: A Close-up*, London, Oxford University Press, p. 105.

14 Ministry of Education (1959) *Primary Education*, London, HMSO, chapter 7.

15 See, for example, North-Eastern Junior Schools Association (1949) *Basic Requirements of the Junior School*, London, University of London Press; STANDISH, E.J. (1959) 'Readiness to read', *Educational Research*, 2, 1.

16 SIMON, B. (1953) *Intelligence Testing and the Comprehensive School*, London, Lawrence & Wishart; MORRIS, M. (1953) *Your Children's Future*, London, Lawrence & Wishart.

17 WALL, W.D. (1959) *Child of Our Times: Cultural Change and the Challenge to Healthy Mental Growth*, London, National Children's Home, pp. 87–90.

18 The most consistent attack on streaming was contained in the journal *Forum: for the discussion of new trends in education*, from its beginning in 1959.

19 SPENCE, J. *et al.* (1954) *A Thousand Families in Newcastle upon Tyne: An Approach to the Study of Health and Illness in Children*, London, Oxford University Press.

20 BOWLBY, J. (1953) *Child Care and the Growth of Love*, Harmondsworth, Penguin; 'The Rediscovery of the Family', a 1954 lecture reprinted in BOWLBY, J. *et al.* (1981) *Rediscovery of the Family and Other Lectures*, Aberdeen, Aberdeen University Press.

21 Bernstein published 'Some sociological determinants of perception' in 1958, and a paper entitled 'Social class and linguistic development: A theory of social learning' based on the earlier one was published in HALSEY, A.H., FLOUD, J. and ARNOLD ANDERSON, C. (Eds) (1961) *Education, Economy, and Society*, New York, Free Press of Glencoe.

22 KELLMER PRINGLE, M.L. (Ed.) (1965) *Deprivation and Education*, London, Longmans, one of her best known works, followed a decade or so of published work in the field.

23 Central Advisory Council for Education (1954) *Early Leaving*, London, HMSO.

24 WINNICOTT, D.W. (1964) *The Child, the Family and the Outside World*, Harmondsworth, Penguin (reprinting mainly 1950s material).

25 FLOUD, J.E., HALSEY, A.H. and MARTIN, F.M. (Eds) (1956) *Social Class and Educational Opportunity*, London, Heinemann; FLOUD, J. and HALSEY, A.H. (1961) 'Homes and schools: Social determinants of educability', *Educational Research*, 3, 2, p. 86.

26 Ministry of Education (1963) *Half Our Future* (The Newsom Report), London, HMSO; BARRON MAYS, J. (1962a) *Education and the Urban Child*,

Liverpool, Liverpool University Press and (1964) *Growing Up in the City: A Study of Juvenile Delinquency in an Urban Neighbourhood*, Liverpool, Liverpool University Press.

27 DOUGLAS, J.W.B. (1964) *The Home and the School: A Study of Ability and Attainment in the Primary School*, London, MacGibbon & Kee. For later work in the same tradition, see for example DAVIE, R., BUTLER, N. and GOLDSTEIN, H. (1922) *From Birth to Seven: The Second Report of the National Child Development Study*, London, Longmans.

28 Committee on Higher Education (1963) *Higher Education: Report*, London, HMSO, pp. 49–54 and (1963) *Higher Education: Appendix One, The Demand for Places in Higher Education*, London, HMSO, pp. 79–84.

29 Department of Education and Science (1967) *Children and their Primary Schools: A Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education* (The Plowden Report), vol. I: *The Report*, London, HMSO.

30 The research findings were included in vol II: *Research and Surveys*, London, HMSO, 1967. Critiques were contained in ACLAND, H. (1973) 'Social determinants of educational achievement: An evaluation and criticism of research', PhD thesis, University of Oxford, and (1980) 'Research as stage management: The case of the Plowden Committee' in BULMER, M. (Ed.) *Social Research and Royal Commissions*, London, Allen & Unwin; BERNSTEIN, B. and DAVIES, B. (1969) 'Some sociological comments on Plowden', in PETERS, R. (Ed.) *Perspectives on Plowden*, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul; GLENNERSTER, H. (1969) 'The Plowden research', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, Series A, 132, pt 2.

31 These and other aspects of the Plowden work and proposals are discussed in SILVER, H. and SILVER, P. (forthcoming) *An Educational War on Poverty*.

32 The Schools Council agreed to give financial support to the Swansea 'Project in Compensatory Education' in November 1967. The project produced a considerable literature. For a summary of the work on children 'at risk' see EVANS R. (1978) 'The identification of children "at risk" of educational handicap" in CHAZAN, M. and WILLIAMS, P. (Eds) *Deprivation and the Infant School*, Oxford, Blackwell.

33 The first, general report on the EPA projects was HALSEY, A.H. (Ed.) (1972) *Educational Priority: EPA Problems and Policies*, London, HMSO. Four other projects, on surveys and statistics, London EPAs, the West Riding project and a Scottish study, appeared in 1974 and 1975. Work on the Liverpool project was reported in a number of publications by Eric Midwinter.

34 The decision to establish such a centre was announced in the House of Commons in July 1975, Centre for Information and Advice on Educational Disadvantage, *First Report*, Manchester (1976), mimeo.

35 See NISBET, J. and WATT, J. (1984) *Educational Disadvantage: Ten Years On*, Edinburgh, HMSO.

36 YOUNG, M.F.D. (Ed.) (1971), *Knowledge and Control: New Directions for the Sociology of Education*, London, Collier Macmillan; KEDDIE, N. (Ed.) (1973) *Tinker, Tailor... The Myth of Cultural Deprivation*, Harmondsworth, Penguin. Published in 1976 in the US and Britain, BOWLES, S. and GINTIS, H. *Schooling in Capitalist America*, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, was extremely influential in this direction.

37 MCVICKER HUNT, J. (1969) *The Challenge of Incompetence and Poverty: Papers on the Role of Early Education*, Urbana, Il, University of Illinois

Press, p. 2; HODGES, W. and SMITH, L. (1980) *Modern Early Childhood: A Review*, Atlanta, GA, mimeo, p. 4.

38 MCVICKER HUNT, J. (1961) *Intelligence and Experience*, New York, Ronald Press; MCVICKER HUNT, J. (1969) *op cit*.

39 SILVER, M. and SILVER, P. (forthcoming) *op cit*.

40 For example, HELLMUTH, J. (Ed.) (1967, 1968 and 1970), *Disadvantaged Child*, New York, Brunner Mazel, vols 1–3.

41 COLEMAN, J.S. *et al.* (1966) *Equality of Educational Opportunity*, Washington, D.C., Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

42 ZIGLER, E.F. (1987) 'Formal schooling for four-year-olds? No' in KAGAN, S.L. and ZIGLER, E.F. (Eds) *Early Schooling: The National Debate*, New Haven, CT, Yale University Press, p. 33.

43 For example, the Research and Policy Committee of the Committee for Economic Development published a report in 1985, entitled *Investing in our Children*, which argued that pre-school programmes had been successful, were clearly 'desirable for 4-year-olds from disadvantaged families', and that school districts should undertake 'a serious and systematic investment in enriched early childhood education for children from poor families' (pp. 43–6).

44 SILVER, H. and SILVER, P. (forthcoming) *op cit*.

45 Nursery School Association of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (n.d.) *Memorandum of Evidence*, mimeo, p. 6.

46 Robert B. Reich traces a historical distinction between American 'civic culture' and 'business culture' in (1983) *The Next American Frontier*, Times Books, chapter 1.

47 A summary of the American effective schools research and literature is COHEN, M. (1982) 'Effective schools: Accumulating research findings', *American Education*, 18, 1. For a critical evaluation see STEDMAN, C. (1985) 'A new look at the effective schools literature', *Urban Education*, 20, 3, and (1987) 'It's time we changed the effective schools formula', *Phi Delta Kappan*, 69, 3.

48 BENNETT, S.N. (1976) *Teaching Styles and Pupil Progress*, London, Open Books; RUTTER, M. *et al.* (1979) *Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and Their Effects on Children*, London, Open Books; MORTIMORE, P. *et al.* (1988) *School Matters: The Junior Years*, London, Open Books.

49 CRESAS (1987) *On n'apprend pas tout seul: Interactions sociales et construction de savoirs*, Paris, les éditions E S F.

50 ELKIND, D. (1987) 'Early childhood education on its own terms' in KAGAN, S.L. and ZIGLER, E.F. (Eds) *op cit*, p. 100.

51 DARLINGTON, R. (1981) 'The consortium for longitudinal studies', *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 3, 6; LAZAR, I. and DARLINGTON, R.B. (Eds) (1978) *Lasting Effects after Preschool: A Report of the Consortium for Longitudinal Studies*, Washington, D.C., Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; LAZAR, I. (1981) 'Early intervention is effective', *Educational Leadership*, 38, 4.

52 The concept underlies William Julius Wilson's (1987) *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy*, Chicago, IL, University of Chicago Press.

53 The 'explicit'/'inexplicit' explanation of differences between US and British approaches to issues of race was propounded by DAVID KIRP in (1979); *Doing Good by Doing Little: Race and Schooling in Britain*, Berkeley, CA, Uni-

versity of California Press.

54 The Fabian Society's submission was discussed by a group of Plowden Committee members with six representatives of the Fabian Society on 18 February 1965. The Society's representatives included Mrs Shirley Williams, M.P. Mrs Peggy Jay, Mr Norman Morris and the General Secretary of the Society, Mr Tom Ponsonby.

55 Bowles and Gintis, in *Schooling in Capitalist America*, rely very heavily on the work of Michael Katz and Clarence Karier in particular.

56 Constancy and change in approaches to teaching are the focus of CUBAN, L. (1984) *How Teachers Taught*, New York, Longman, and appear in the book's sub-title, 'Constancy and change in American classrooms 1890–1980'.

57 CREMIN, L.A. (1988) *American Education: The Metropolitan Experience 1876–1980*, New York, Harper & Row.

58 LOWE, R. (1988) *Education in the Post-War Years: A Social History*, London, Routledge, Introduction.

59 GROTBERG, E.H. (Ed.) (1977) *200 Years of Children*, Washington, D.C., Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

60 HURT, J. (1984) 'Reformatory and industrial schools before 1933', *History of Education*, 13, 1; GOMERSALL, M. (1988) 'Ideals and realities: The education of working-class girls, 1800–1870', *History of Education*, 17, 1; ROACH, J. (1986) 'Boys and girls in school, 1800–70', *History of Education*, 15, 3.

61 FINKELSTEIN, B. (1984) 'Incorporating children into the history of education', *Journal of Educational Thought*, 18, 1; (1985) 'Courting networks of good influence: The reconstruction of childhood in the United States' in HAWES, J.M. and HINER, N.R. (Eds) *American Childhood*, Westport, CT; KIRP, D. (1979) *op cit*.

62 BRYANT, M.E. (1986) *The London Experience of Secondary Education*, London, Athlone Press; HURT, J.S. (1988) *Outside the Mainstream: A History of Special Education*, London, Batsford.

63 KATZ, M.B. (1968) in *The Irony of School Reform*, Cambridge, MA, interpreted the extension and reform of mid-nineteenth century education in Massachusetts as 'the attempt of a coalition of the social leaders, status-anxious parents, and status-hungry educators to impose educational innovation, each for their own reasons, upon a reluctant community' (p. 218). Michael Ignatieff's (1978) *A Just Measure of Pain: The Penitentiary in the Industrial Revolution, 1750–1850*, New York, Columbia University Press, is an example from another historical field. A valuable discussion of the social control and related theories in historical terms is SUTTON, J.R., (1988) *Stubborn Children: Controlling Delinquency in the United States, 1640–1981*, Berkeley, CA, University of California Press.

Chapter 10

Policy Problems in Time

The general thrust of the argument in this book has been concerned with 'historical policy analysis' as a point of entry into considerations of educational change. This focus could easily be misunderstood as an argument either for the total reorientation of the history of education or an imperialist conquest of the policy territory. The focus on educational change and the discussion of the nature of historical analysis have been intended to point in a particular but not an exclusive direction. Other histories and other purposes remain — histories of processes and of institutions, of people and of practices, of ideas and of experience — and the claims for a policy dimension seek to extend and reform the existing historical field, not to replace it. It is appropriate at this point to return to a discussion of the kinds of incursion that are intended, with what aims and proposed outcomes. It is also perhaps appropriate to indicate some sources of the historical and policy emphases represented here.

In discussing policy at all there is a danger of boarding a bandwagon, and of composing for it another theme tune. We have seen in the 1980s the emergence of new policy departments, policy journals, books on educational policy. As in the late nineteenth century, when everything became 'science' — historical science, prison science . . . — all could now become policy. There are already 'policy sciences'. What we have in fact is a policy 'rage', one which goes well beyond traditional approaches to social policy, beyond description of how things work and the roles of constituencies in the making and implementation of policy, beyond administration — which in education as elsewhere has been the main claimant to the copyright.

Why is there so much concern with policy, and particularly the growing interest in educational policy-making? Clearly, in times of economic difficulty or political tension or real or imagined crisis — to use Alice Rivlin's formulation — policy-makers at all levels are concerned about choices — perhaps right choices, perhaps (by one criterion or another)

acceptable choices. That is obviously one part of the context within which policy analysts ask questions, or are asked questions. In relatively untroubled times the process is muted — one of minor changes, minor defences of the *status quo*, reacting withia a consensus or a tradition: there is no reason in that situation, except highly selectively, to confront policy dilemmas. When the need emerges, however, to prevent too much disturbance in the polity, or to anticipate adverse processes, or to ward off dangers of any kind, policy concerns may develop in a minor key, and dissatisfaction with policy understandings may become explicit. And then in difficult times, the establishment of priorities in complex and confrontational situations gives rise to the bandwagon, or perhaps more accurately to a shift from minor to major. That seems a workable, if slightly rickety, hypothesis for what has happened since the beginning of the 1960s.

Historians, we have suggested, have not been engaged in policy analysis in any serious, explicit and systematic way. Why that is so, whether it matters, and future directions, are questions that have been central to previous chapters, and it is important to address them here directly. There are, of course, historians interested in policy, but often alongside and detached from other concerns, in a form of advanced academic schizophrenia. Only rarely has a historian like David Tyack or Carl Kaestle in the United States attempted to bring the history and the policy together. The British, by and large, have not made the attempt. There are additionally policy analysts who — like the Americans David Kirp or the late Stephen Bailey, or Maurice Kogan in Britain — often become 'honorary historians'. Although some historians of education may reside, notably in the United States, in departments which have policy titles or directions, their contributions to policy scholarship, to analysis of policy present and recent past, are rare. In the absence of research into the configuration of contemporary historians we can only guess at the reasons.

In some cases it is clearly because policy analysis appears to be conservative. Its origins appear to lie in conservative responses to change or threatened change, and it appears contaminated by the very policy choices and decisions it is called on to explore. It also appears conservative in the sense that it may be held to deal with short-term stabilizing effects of the longer-term and more profound processes that are amenable to more radical theoretical and ideological analysis. It may be misused for conservative purposes. That is probably part of a range of assumptions, or perhaps misconceptions, about policy analysis. The whole range would include assumptions that policy analysis is a superficial, conservative exercise; is largely identified with or serves government; is focussed on evaluation and judgment; is involved with the messy detail of current, day-to-day practice and political controversy; is too interdisciplinary or too con-

cerned with model-making for historians. Other misconceptions follow, including one that history must not become involved — to use a vocabulary of the late 1960s and 1970s — with 'presentist' purposes, must not have its targets defined by the structures, political concerns and ideologies of contemporary society. There are variants of all of these assumptions and resistances — to do, for example, with the apparent humanistic concerns of the historian as opposed to the rationalistic models of the policy analyst. There is something, it would seem, disreputable in the here-and-now, and historians like to keep their distance, and their respectability. They are prepared to identify the bad guys, preferably in archives, but they are not prepared to sup with them.

Policy has been described as a form of 'purposive activity'.[1] It is an elusive concept, a process providing 'major guidelines for action', creating frameworks 'that allow discretion yet provide direction', anticipating action, pointing towards 'some intended or desired end'.[2] The analysis of policy is therefore concerned with its origins and intentions — the complexities of competing and conflicting values and goals, the explicit and inexplicit representation of objectives which spring from diverse economic and social realities. It is concerned with the policy choices that are made, the decisions made — by whom, with what timing and with what authority. It is concerned with the guidelines, the rules and regulations, the machineries of information and enactment, the forms of implementation, the interpretation in practice, the responses, the outcomes. At its most theoretical the analysis is concerned with what happens and why; at its most pragmatically historical it asks what, in known instances, seems to have happened.

Education policy analysis as a field of academic interest came late to Britain, and developed slowly, by comparison with the establishment in the United States of structures within which policy analysis, policy studies and related research emerged — in both public and private contexts. In some other countries — Sweden and Australia for example — policy units with specific research interests and a variety of approaches appeared, paying sustained attention to the precise policy processes in such fields as higher education. In Britain, as in other countries, the ancestry of educational policy interests lies to some degree in the history of legislation, in the political and economic history of education, in administrative history, in the concerns of political science, and from the 1970s in particular in the parallel growth of evaluation as a public demand and as a field of professional interest. In the United States one of the cradles for the new development lay in the comprehensive attention paid to 'public policy', largely in emergent graduate schools bearing that label, and very often with a dominantly political-science focussed personnel. The development took place in parallel with government agencies, within private research

and evaluation bodies of various kinds, and in the research departments of major corporations.

In Britain since the Second World War the dominant directions of research and scholarship in the educational field have been psychological and sociological, concerned with issues of learning and selection, systems, structures and the knowledge content of schooling, and not by and large with policy issues — with the obvious exception of the prolonged concern with aspects of comprehensive schooling. There is, indeed, a British literature which addresses policy issues. Kogan and various collaborators have ranged over aspects of public policy-making in terms of educational structures, government and administration, with attention to the processes of change. Salter and Tapper have entered the field from the politics of education, and have confronted problems largely ignored by sociologists until the publication of McPherson and Raab's *Governing Education* (though even in this case a book that declared itself to be 'sociology of policy' was co-authored by a sociologist and a political scientist). There is a plentiful literature of administrative interest.

If historians become policy interpreters it tends to be from a suitable distance. There are, of course, exceptions, and this would apply to British historians concerned with the 1944 Education Act and what followed, or Americans concerned with education and the Cold War. In relation to policy, however, historians prefer the telescopic lens. The history of policy reaches out therefore in a number of directions. In Britain in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries it took the form of the history of Parliamentary efforts at legislation[3] and in subsequent decades it described, and in some cases attempted to explain, ways in which the system had changed or been extended, at the elementary and secondary levels.[4] Some of this work bordered on, and has more recently been directly concerned with, the history of national or local administration.[5] Some overseas scholars have taken a particular interest in characteristic features of British higher education history, its organizational development, its social and cultural explanations.[6] Some historians in the twentieth century have taken a special interest in the social movements in which educational energies were released or became directed towards specific targets, such as adult or infant education.[7] It is rare, however, for historians of policy, and of the administrative and political structures and conflicts within which it has taken shape, to see their work as having contemporary policy implications, or to tie their work to the interests of policy-directed or policy-related research. The largely American interest in 'public history' has brought some historians closer to policy considerations, but not in the field of education in Britain, where there has been a considerable divide between policy interests and those of historical research. Historians in this and related fields have been reluctant to address problem-solving, theore-

tical, methodological or other issues prevalent in those disciplines which have largely nourished the development of policy research and analysis.

The history of policy within those constraints has therefore produced in Britain a considerable literature concerned with the growth of national and local administration, the legislation and personalities, an interest in the state, in the evolution of a system-wide policy for particular levels of provision, and for the curriculum — interests matched in one way or another in North America, Europe and elsewhere. The kinds of questions asked by historians of nineteenth-century education in Britain have included: the role of religious conflict in delaying legislation; the accuracy of available statistics and how far they have led or misled legislators, or how they have been otherwise used; whether pressures for educational provision and reform in England aimed at policies for change to safeguard the *status quo*; the influence of commissions and committees on government policy; the influence on policy of individuals and parties; the effects of changes in employment. Gillian Sutherland, discussing the making of policy in the late nineteenth century, comments:

> Policy-making in England and Wales between 1870 and 1895 was essentially a political activity. It cannot therefore be explained without reference to the whole web of interests, constraints, ideas and attitudes that characterized the political life of the period.[8]

How far that picture of a 'web' can be extended into the twentieth century depends to a considerable extent on how far outwards the boundaries of 'political life' can be extended. Gillian Sutherland has herself extended this telescopic comment on the nineteenth century into the present century with her work on testing and local authority policy.[9] There has still, however, been little attempt by educational historians of this kind to speak directly to and with current policy concerns and processes.

Historians could all write their own scenarios for the priority pre-twentieth century historical concerns, and for the organizing concepts in which they have preferred and now prefer to incorporate them — class, control, hegemony, the corporate state, bureaucracy... What we tend to find is complex and often alternative descriptions and interpretations of policies which are securely of the past, and which reach out only very long and slender tentacles of meaning into the present, and of orientation into the future. While there are resistances and obstacles of these kinds in historians' approaches to policy analysis, policy analysts and policy-makers have themselves in a loose sense all become historians now, at least in the assumptions they often make about the past. Carl Kaestle warns that if historians do not make the difficult move from the nineteenth century to the policy concerns of the contemporary world, others are ready to do it for them.[10] David Tyack, considering why historians are reluctant to

examine the policy implications of their work, suggests that 'everyone is a historian'.[11] If, as Richard Rose indicates in a study of policy research in British universities, the 'most sophisticated forms of explanation are usually historical',[12] it is churlish of historians themselves not to do some of the work. The alternative is for the 'everyone' who does it either to make unsupported assumptions or to continue the ritualistic versions of history frequently met with in dissertations and learned work, where the history becomes preface, 'context', largely unrelated to what follows.

Explanations of policy processes point, as we have seen, to wide-ranging historical research agendas, including policy origins in competing pressures and at points and in ways difficult to identify and requiring historical attention — as do the goals, choices and decisions, and the uncertain relationships between policy and implementation and practice. The processes require historical explanations of the competing intentions and inchoate purposes, conflicts and invisible structures and networks in which policies may be shaped. The apparently 'purposive activity' suggests a rationality from which historians and others may need to set out, but on which historical analysis may well cast doubt for a variety of reasons in its search for alternative pasts. It may do so in the kinds of ways in which feminist historians have cast doubt on previous explanations of purposive activity. It may do so by exposing not only the unexpected outcomes but also the unexpected early energies and alternative pressures released by the policy process itself, or by suggesting the ways in which policy people ignore, use and misuse social science and other research knowledge in an attempted 'hyper-rationality'. Policy analysts are normally, in this whole process, highly reluctant to summon — or more precisely to be seen to be summoning — historical evidence. Historians are not there to provide it. Homeworks are not done.

My own interest in these issues, in the field and in a conception of historical policy analysis came from the convergence of a number of research engagements with processes in adjacent territories. First was the study of nineteenth-century reform and many of its surrounding controversies — especially in relation to the beginnings of mass education and the motivations and directions involved. Where did the intentions come from? What was actually being advocated? What did the words mean? Where did the priority explanations lie? Which of the conceptual machineries being used as organizing interpretations were helpful? There were no secure answers, and some of the American historians discussed in earlier chapters were beginning in important ways to undermine answers which had appeared to be secure, to search — not always with great success — for alternatives, and to explore questions and dimensions not previously addressed. Putting those mounting uncertainties together with longer and firmer British traditions of social and economic historical analy-

sis of various kinds began for me the process of generating at least a 'telescopic' concern with policy issues.[13]

Turning, secondly, to more recent history, I found intriguing areas of research in the processes, forums and interpretations of what I termed 'opinion', to distinguish these from the processes differently approached in terms of ideology. The interest spanned social science movements and related social changes in late nineteenth-century Britain and the United States, and strands of various kinds linking education with social movements and social policy in the twentieth century. I found myself trying to adapt ways of approaching questions about early nineteenth-century Owenism or late nineteenth-century social science to recent concerns, in reality, debate and rhetoric — inequality, standards, vocationalism or the policies which aimed to use education against poverty in the United States and in Britain — all reflected in previous chapters of this book.[14]

A long project in which I was a partner looked at British and American education policies and programmes relating to problems of poverty and disadvantage in the 1960s and 1970s.[15] This work increasingly became policy analysis at multiple levels, and whatever the assistance we may have tried to recruit from other styles of analysis, the questions asked have been essentially historical ones about the roles of Congress or state administrators, teachers or project directors, funding decision-makers, researchers in psychology and sociology and linguistics, or evaluators. It has often been difficult to pin this down as 'historical research', especially as everyone wants to know what 'conclusions' we are coming to! It has to be understood, however, that work of this kind may — once a policy focus is established — become an operation quite different from what is commonly understood by political or any other kind of history. This research, in demonstrating and seeking examples for the congruence of social science, educational experiment and political programmes in the United States of the early and mid-1960s, or the reasons why American experience of education against disadvantage was not considered seriously in apparently similar British conditions until later in the 1960s, had to address questions and operate at levels that made the 'historical policy analysis' more hybrid than historians may normally find comfortable. Moving between the offices of a state governor and a local project director, Congress and classroom, the homes of retired HMIs and university departments, became an unusual historical enterprise.

The basic question raised by such work has been how, as a historian, to penetrate these confusions of recent events and connections of ideas and processes and outcomes; how, as a historian, not as something else (citizen, or some other kind of professional, for example) to get dirty, to sup with seductive devils? Not, it is important to add, that the policy trail is always what it seems. In the early 1980s, the Educational Policy Depart-

ments, or departments with similar titles, that I visited in the United States had begun to proliferate phoenix-like out of the embers of Educational Foundation Departments. Times were hazardous, students hard to come by, identities suddenly important amidst constituencies decreasingly sympathetic, and 'policy' sometimes seen to be a more reliable disguise or immortality. In some places, within the new Policy definition, Educational Sociology, for instance, had become Educational Policy (Sociology), and History of Education had become Educational Policy (History), without too much discernible change. Perhaps better in parentheses than in oblivion.

Historians, as we have emphasized, are faced with the constant obstacles raised by concepts and their attendant hazards. Historians, even when least aware of it, are plunging into theories and models and conceptual minefields, but have difficulties with those areas of the social and political sciences where the concepts are not only explicit but fiercely argued over. They have similar difficulties with the abstractions of other scholars. Policy theorists discuss policy processes in terms of models — an engineering model, a cybernetic model, an enlightenment model, for example, of the relationship between research and policy. Policy research is mission-oriented, non-mission-oriented, quantitative, qualitative, interactionist, percolative. All models aim at some measure of prediction, and therefore create another obstacle for historians, who look upon models as some kind of almanac. Torsten Husen tells the story of being invited to address a parent-teacher association meeting shortly after he had completed his doctoral thesis on problems of adolescent development. After his lecture someone asked: 'Tell me, doctor, how late does developmental psychology think that it is appropriate for a 14-year-old girl to be out in the evening?'.[16] Historians are afraid of that kind of question: 'Tell me, expert in the successes and failures of the past, what does history think that it is appropriate for the party to advocate in its next election manifesto?' Or, 'what does your work on the nineteenth century tell me about the decision I must take this afternoon about the allocation of resources to schools in the South-East suburb?' Or simply, 'what conclusions is your work coming to?' (especially, 'what useful conclusions?').

What happens is that the historian chooses distance and detail, or ideology and grand theory — the former in order to escape the questions, the latter in order to alter them. In the second case, many historians have in recent decades tried to disclose 'real', 'underlying' historical causes and processes and explanations of our contemporary dilemmas, and have made sustained efforts to give historical analysis a meaning and even a mission. The process has been strewn with major divisions about a number of things — including the relationship between history and theory, interpretations and reinterpretations of both and of their connections.

Varieties, categories, even typologies, of the history of education have emerged, projecting research and debate constantly into new directions and retreading old ones. One of the crucial examples of this that we have seen has been the American work associated with historians like Katznelson and Weir, Hogan and Peterson — all looking afresh at the relationships of social class and ethnicity, public organization and popular activity, schooling and the complexities of local politics.[17] As we have also seen, the closest parallels to such work in Britain have come from other directions — including that of McPherson and Raab, and Tapper and Salter. The latter cautiously confront and use theory — especially Marxist theory — but in serious dialogue with detailed processes about which they are prepared to do careful historical homework. In discussing their view of the 'educational state' — a concept central to their analytical concerns — they underline, for example, their acceptance that 'education is an instrument of class control', but

> we do not accept that it will always be a successful instrument. Education is not the automatic servicing agency of the ruling class that some Marxists believe it to be; it is an instrument of class control but not one which operates in a blanket fashion to the permanent and inevitable advantage of that alleged ruling class.[18]

Their analysis and conclusion have a historical heartbeat, though — as with the American work of the early 1980s — there is little left at the end of the very concept of 'class control' which the argument addresses. The 'concrete terms' in which Tapper and Salter conduct the discussion are inevitably historical, and among other things they point to the modest analytical positions of what has been called the process of 'thinking small' in approaches to understanding policy.[19] This is not just a corrective to theory, it is theory, or at least without an understanding of the dynamics of change in concrete terms there is no valuable theory. Policy theory without a struggle to establish the historical dynamic is a form of play.

What historians have tended to do is make assumptions about the policy process, their main attention being directed elsewhere. The policy process may become an important context — to the history of textbooks, or teacher supply, or literacy, or whatever. In the ambitions of a Cremin or a Ravitch it is certainly a strand, even an explanation. In general, however, the varieties of policy context are too familiar to need comment, it is the policy *focus* that needs emphasis — not the telescopic lens version, but the one directed to more recent targets. In the United States these are visible, for example, in the work of Tyack, Lowe and Hansot on public schooling during the Great Depression and in contemporary America.[20] They are present in work on curriculum and the Cold War, race, gender, accounts of US educational legislation from the National

Defense Education Act of 1958 to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and beyond, and wider questions of education and public values.[21] One of the reasons why the focus is often interpreted narrowly is the problem of approaching an interdisciplinary field from an academic base reflecting departmental structures and their professional imperatives, the dominant tradition of a discipline, and the assertion of its centrality to the processes of research and explanation in the field.[22] Policy analysis is essentially interdisciplinary, and is probably at its best collaborative. That being the case, it is important to underline what precise contributions historians might most productively make to the education policy field, and to the ways in which it is organized and conducted. What follows is no more than a checklist towards the fuller discussion that is necessary.

First, history of education can relate more closely to, and become more involved in, the work emanating from other disciplines — from the politics of education, from administration, from social policy . . . subjecting their machineries and concepts to precise historical scrutiny, bringing history in from the periphery and the framework to the central organization of the argument, engaging with the conceptual and theoretical contents of the argument, and providing it with the longer trajectory of explanation and interpretation.

Secondly, it can tackle more frontally the hesitations that have existed about policy and about its relation to government, confronting questions that non-historians frequently consider — about, for example, the relationship between research and policy-making. Government may, for instance, commission and fail to use, or may misuse, research. Research may be monopolized for opposition purposes. Policy-makers may inform the direction and content of research, and research may have differential impacts in systems with more or less centralized systems. Every fragment of that and other aspects of the research-policy relationship is amenable to, and demands, more direct historical attention than it has received so far.

Thirdly, the same applies to the reservations held by historians (and not only historians) about policy analysis being an essentially conservative exercise. The argument may be comfortable, but it is not self-evidently true. All social scholarship may be conservative, or not.

Finally, historical research can considerably strengthen the multi-level approach to policy analysis, exploring policy formation over time in relation to levels of government and administration, the diverse experience of policy pressure, resistance, purpose, and failure, the intellectual and institutional processes involved. Historians can expose clinical policy models to other questions, other dimensions of explanation.

In such directions lies controversy, and the argument here is that historical concern with change cannot be so exclusive as to refrain from entering it. Historians' strategies for explaining the past enable them to

subvert hermetic assumptions about the present, and to share in the delineation of alternative futures. The argument points away from the use of history to transmit occasional messages or to underpin rhetorics, and instead points towards a recent-historical, policy-focussed approach to education. It does not deny the importance of other histories, but suggests a different picture of historical research and those danger areas in which it is important for it to have a serious operational base. It involves commitment to the explanation of *intended* change as well as change itself, *intended* stability as well as stability itself, what Tyack calls 'critical understanding' and Cuban sees in terms of making 'policy images more accurate'.[23] Approached in this way it marries the problematics of historical research with the fumbling yet confident generalizations of model makers, in order to bring both more realistically and usefully to an understanding of the central processes at work in the 'concrete terms' of 'this world'. In women's history and some other areas there are important interdisciplinary lessons to be learned. In collaboration there is also a useful act of humility for historians.

In the various 'crises' of recent years, particularly in Britain, a more public historical voice considering the antecedents and derivations of crises has been lacking. American versions of educational disaster and apocalypse have tended to be silent about their pasts. Commissions concerned with education in Britain, in the nineteenth century and up to the Second World War, regularly reaffirmed or reassessed their histories, whereas in recent decades such commissions and official White Papers, Green Papers, statements and circulars from the Department of Education and Science and Her Majesty's Inspectorate have lost a sense of historical anchorage that informed earlier documents. Apocalypse has become infectious, and historians are otherwise engaged. Policy-makers are reluctant to give house room to history. Historians have not been enthusiastic about research which addresses what Stearns calls 'policy problems in time', research which keeps in mind the problems and experience of the 'acted upon' as well as the 'actors'.[24] Historians have much of importance to offer in the broad field of understanding the related processes of policy and educational change, a field in which their job is often either left vacant, or done part-time by others on their behalf. Historians re-entering education with a policy orientation may also have something to learn.

Notes

1 Beswick, D.G. and Harman, G.S. (1983) *Education Policy in Australia*, Melbourne, Centre for the Study of Higher Education, p. 3.

2 Corson, D. (1986) 'Policy in social context: A collapse of holistic planning in

education', *Journal of Education Policy*, 1, 1, p. 5.

3 See, for example, BALFOUR, G. (1898) *The Educational Systems of Great Britain and Ireland*, Oxford, Clarendon Press; CRAIK, H. (1884) *The State in its Relation to Education*, London, Macmillan.

4 On elementary education see BIRCHENOUGH, C. (1938) *History of Elementary Education in England and Wales from 1800 to the Present Day*, London, University Tutorial Press; on secondary education see ARCHER, R.L. (1921) *Secondary Education in the Nineteenth Century*, London, Cambridge University Press.

5 GOSDEN, P.H.J.H. (1966) *The Development of Educational Administration in England and Wales*, Oxford, Blackwell; GOSDEN, P.H.J.H. and SHARP, P.R. (1978) *The Development of an Education Service: The West Riding 1889–1974*, Oxford, Martin Robertson.

6 BERDAHL, R.O. (1959) *British Universities and the State*, London, Cambridge University Press; ROTHBLATT, S. (1976) *Tradition and Change in English Liberal Education*, London, Faber & Faber.

7 DOBBS, A.E. (1919) *Education and Social Movements, 1700–1850*, London, Longmans, Green; SIMON, B. (1960) *Studies in the History of Education 1780–1870*, London, Lawrence & Wishart and (1965) *Education and the Labour Movement 1870–1920*, London, Lawrence & Wishart; SILVER, H. (1965) *The Concept of Popular Education: A Study of Ideas and Social Movements in the Early Nineteenth Century*, London, MacGibbon & Kee.

8 SUTHERLAND, G. (1973) *Policy-Making in Elementary Education 1870–1895*, London, Oxford University Press, p. 347.

9 SUTHERLAND, G. (1984) *Ability, Merit and Measurement: Mental Testing and English Education, 1880–1940*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

10 KAESTLE, C. (1983) *Pillars of the Republic: Common Schools and American Society, 1780–1860*, New York, Hill & Wang, p. 223.

11 TYACK, D.B. (1979) 'History and policy-making in public education: A reappraisal' in WALBERG, H.J. (Ed.) *American Education: Diversity and Research*, Washington, D.C., Voice of America, p. 28.

12 ROSE, R. (1982) 'Policy research: What universities can do', *Political Quarterly*, 53, 2, p. 203.

13 SILVER, H. (1965) *op cit*.

14 SILVER, H. (1980) *Education and the Social Condition*, London, Methuen and (1983) *Education as History*, London, Methuen (see Introduction for a discussion of 'opinion'); ideology is discussed passim in (1973) *Equal Opportunity in Education: Education and the Social Condition*, London, Methuen). For vocationalism see SILVER, H. and BRENNAN, J. (1988) *A Liberal Vocationalism*, London, Methuen.

15 The project, sponsored by the Social Science Research Council, and reported on (to what was by then the Economic and Social Research Council), was entitled 'British and American educational strategies against poverty in the 1960s and 1970s' and run jointly with Pamela Silver. *An Educational War on Poverty*, arising from the project, also co-authored, is forthcoming.

16 HUSEN, T. (1968) 'Educational research and the state' in WALL, W.D. and HUSEN, T. (Eds) *Educational Research and Policy-Making*, Slough, National Foundation for Educational Research, p. 14.

17 HOGAN, *Class and Reform*; KATZNELSON and WEIR, *Schooling for All*; PETERSON, *The Politics of School Reform 1870–1940*.

18 TAPPER, T. and SALTER, B. (1978) *Education and the Political Order: Chang-*

ing Patterns of Class Control, London, Macmillan.

19 KLEIN, R. (1980) 'Creating problems' (review of Wildavsky, *The Art and Craft of Policy Analysis*), *New Society*, 17 July, p. 141.

20 TYACK, LOWE and HANSOT, *Public Schools in Hard Times*.

21 SPRING, J. (1976) *The Sorting Machine: National Educational Policy Since 1945*, New York, McKay; CLOWSE, B.B. (1981) *Brainpower for the Cold War: The Sputnik Crisis and the National Defense Education Act of 1958*, Westport, CT, Greenwood; DAVIS GRAHAM, H. (1984) *The Uncertain Triumph: Federal Education Policy in the Kennedy and Johnson Years*, Chapel Hill, NC, University of North Carolina Press; LAZERSON, M. *et al.* (1985) *An Education of Value: The Purposes and Practices of Schools*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

22 ROSE, R. (1982) *op cit*, p. 209; BARRETT, S. and FUDGE, C. (1981) 'Examining the policy-action relationship' in BARRETT, S. and FUDGE, C. (Eds) *Policy and Action: Essays on the Implementation of Public Policy*, p. 7.

23 TYACK, D.B. (1979) *op cit*, p. 31; CUBAN, L. (1982) 'Enduring resiliency: Enacting and implementing federal vocational education legislation' in KANTOR, H. and TYACK, D.B. (Eds) *Work, Youth, and Schooling: Historical Perspectives on Vocationalism in American Education*, Stanford, CA, Stanford University Press, p. 78.

24 STEARNS, P.N. (1984) 'History and public policy' in MCCALL, G.J. and WEBER, G.H. (Eds) *Social Science and Public Policy: The Roles of Academic Disciplines in Policy Analysis*, Port Washington, Associated Faculty Press, pp. 99–100.

Index

Aaron, H.J., 26
Academic Advisory Committees (AACs), 43, 45
accountability, 38, 47, 58–75 *passim*, 83, 91–5
accreditation, 36, 45, 50, 51, 68, 160
Adelman, C., 20
adolescence, 86, 136, 137, 155, 171, 218
Africa, 148–9, 150, 155, 160
Ahier, J., 20
Altenbaugh, R.J., 176, 179
American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 61
American Social Science Association, 152
A Nation at Risk, 14
Anderson Committee (grants to students, 1960), 58, 84
Angus, D.L., 182
Annan, Lord, 79, 82
Arnold, M., 153
Arnove, R.F., 170–1
Assessment of Performance Unit (APU), 159
Association of University Teachers (AUT), 58, 82
Atkin, J.M., 25–6
Australia, 65, 148, 154–5, 159, 160
Avrich, P., 176, 179

Bailey, S.K., 212
Bailyn, B., 21, 166–7
Baker, K., 94
Banting, K., 34
Bardach, E., 23
Bedford College, 41, 42–3
Beecher, C., 178
Bell, T.H., 14
Ben-David, J., 37
Bennett, S.N., 199
Berman, B., 169
Bernstein, B., 157–8, 159, 193, 194, 199
Berrol, S., 180
Best, J.H., 179, 184
Better Opportunities in Technical Education (White Paper, 1961), 106
binary policy, 47, 59, 64, 68–70, 79, 83, 85, 87, 89, 93
Birmingham University, 45
Black Papers, 91
Blackstone, T., 28–9
Booth, C., 129
Bowlby, J., 193, 194
Bowles, S., 168, 170, 172, 183, 203
Boyer, E., 14
Brenzel, B.M., 170, 177
British Council, 160
Bryant, M.E., 205
Brooke, P., 91
Browne, S., 50, 51
Burt, C., 156, 191
Business and Technician Education Council (BTEC), 51, 116–18, 122, 126–8
Business Education Council (BEC), 104, 116–17, 126–7, 128, 132, 137

Callahan, R.E., 169, 183

Cambridge University, 36, 37, 38, 49, 87, 151, 152, 162
Canada, 120, 148, 151, 154, 155, 175
Cammaerts, F.C.A., 69–70
Caplan, N., 22–3
Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 171
Carr Saunders report (*Education for Commerce*, 1949), 107
Catholic education, 10–11, 167, 173
Certificate of Pre-Vocational Education (CPVE), 122, 123, 126, 127, 128
Change, educational, 1–4
Chapter I, 198
also see Education Consolidation and Improvement Act
Chelsea College, 45, 51
Chicago, 169, 172
Circular 323 (1957), 131–2
Cistone, P.J., 20
City and Guilds of London Institute (CGLI), 107, 116, 122
Clifford, G., 177
Cohen, D.K., 24
Cohen, R.D., 169, 178
Cohen, S., 168, 177, 179
Coldstream report (*Vocational Courses in Colleges and Schools of Art*, 1962), 107
Coleman, J.S., 32
Colleges of Advanced Technology (CATs), 43, 45, 63–4, 68–9, 75
Colleges and Institutes of Higher Education, 47, 64, 65, 72, 81, 83, 88, 94, 112, 160
Committee of Directors of Polytechnics (CDP), 70, 71, 72
Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals (CVCP), 49, 51
Community colleges, 59, 63, 68
compensatory education, 15, 158–9, 192, 195, 197, 198, 203
comprehensive schools, 28, 111, 158, 192, 214
Conant, J.B., 26
Conservative government, 90–6 *passim*, 102, 109, 117
Conservative Party, 91
Conservative Political Centre, 90–1
continuous assessment, 48
Council for National Academic Awards (CNAA), 38, 46–8, 49, 51, 58–9, 63–4, 68–75 *passim*, 80, 92, 113–14, 125–6, 128, 131, 160
credit transfer, 160
Cremin, L.A., 2, 9–10, 167, 168, 178, 180, 181–2, 184, 204, 205–6, 219
Crick, B., 89
Crosland, A., 64, 70–1, 79, 87
Crowther Committee (*15 to 18*, 1959), 107–8
Cuban, L., 177, 205, 221
Curti, M., 166, 169, 184

Dainton, Sir F., 86, 91
Dale, R.R., 49
Darknell, F.A., 171
Department of Education and Science (DES), 59, 68, 70, 71, 80, 84, 87, 130, 221
Department of Science and Art, 104, 107, 112
Dewey, J., 105, 107, 110, 111–12, 140, 156, 161
Diploma of Higher Education (DipHE), 47
Diploma in Technology (Dip Tech), 43, 46, 131–2
disadvantage, 13, 159, 189–206
diversification in higher education, 39, 67, 74, 160
Doris, J., 27
Douglas, J.W.B., 194
Dyer, T., 177

Eccles, Lord, 83
The Economist, 87
Educating Americans for the 21st Century, 14
Education Act (1870), 152
Education Act (1944), 192, 194, 214
Education: A Framework for Expansion (White Paper, 1972), 88–9
Educational Priority Areas (EPAs), 159, 195–6, 203
Education and Training for Young People (White Paper, 1985), 118–9
Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (1981), 13
Education Reform Act (1988), 94–5
Edwards, E.G., 87
effective schools, 199–200

Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1965), 13–14, 197, 220
Elvin, L., 49
employment, 95, 101–8 *passim*, 115–17, 119, 124, 135–40
Entwistle, H., 108, 109–10
evacuation, 192
Exeter University, 41, 44
external degrees, 35, 38–46 *passim*, 64, 75
external examiners, 39, 42–3, 50, 51, 81
Europe, 102, 139, 148–62 *passim*, 215

Fabian Society, 201
Fenwick, K., 27
Finkelstein, B., 24, 172, 176–80 *passim*, 205
Floud, J.E., 194
Follow Through, 159
Ford, B., 79, 89
Ford Foundation, 158, 171, 197, 199, 201
Foucault, M., 168, 170, 172
Franklin, B.M., 176
further education, 58, 64, 70, 74, 90–1, 100–41
Further Education Unit (FEU), 95, 103, 106, 108, 109, 111, 118–24 *passim*, 128, 136, 139–40

Garet, M.S., 24
Garnett College, 124
Gary plan, 169, 178
gender, 11, 135–6, 151, 179, 201
General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE), 131
general education, 67, 103–10 *passim*, 118, 119, 129–35
Germany, 67, 152–3, 156, 158
Gintis, H., 168, 170, 172, 183, 203
Goodenow, R.K., 179, 180
Goodlad, J.I., 14
Grace, G., 29
Graff, H.J., 175
Graham, H.D., 173
Graham, P.A., 30
Graves, J., 28
Great Society, The, 26
Green Papers
see Higher Education into the 1990s
Greer, C., 168
Grubb, W.N., 24, 173
Guardian, The, 81, 91

Hadow report (*The Primary School*, 1931), 156, 190, 191
Hahn, K., 155
Hailsham, Lord, 82, 83
Hale report (*University Teaching Methods*, 1964), 49
Haley, M., 170, 183
Hall, J.S., 155
Halsey, A.H., 84, 85, 157–8, 194
Hamilton, D., 20
Hampson, K., 90
Hansot, E., 29, 30, 174, 177, 178, 184, 219
Hartley University College
see Southampton University
Hartog, Sir P., 49
Haslegrave report (NACEIC, 1969), 107
Hayes, C., 122–3
Head Start, 158, 159, 197, 198, 200, 201
Hebb, D.O., 197
Hencke, D., 89
Her Majesty's Inspectors (HMI), 51, 92, 217, 221
Higher Education Facilities Act (1963), 59, 60
Higher Education into the 1990s (Green Paper, 1985), 81–2, 93–4
Higher Education: Meeting the Challenge (White Paper, 1987), 94–5
Higher National Certificate (HNC), 107
Hogan, D.J., 169, 172, 180–4 *passim*, 219
Hoggart, R., 43
House of Commons, 71, 82
House of Lords, 63, 82, 94
Hull University, 39–41, 42
Hurt, J.S., 205
Husen, T., 22, 24, 158, 218

Iannocone, L., 20
Ignatieff, M., 172, 205
Illinois, University of, 66
India, 148–9, 155
Industrial Training Act (1964), 104
Industrial Training Boards, 120

Institutes of Higher Education
see Colleges and Institutes of Higher Education
Ireland, 150, 151

James Committee (teacher education, 1972), 68, 88–9
James, T., 173, 180
Johnson, H.C., 7–8
Johnson, L.B., 60, 158
Johnson, R., 129–30
Jones, A., 111
Jorgenson, L.P., 10–11, 167
Joseph, Sir K., 81–2, 90–3

Kaestle, C.F., 169–81 *passim*, 212, 215
Katz, M.B., 26, 168, 172, 182, 183, 205
Katznelson, I., 168, 180, 182–3, 219
Kay-Shuttleworth, Sir J., 150
Keele University
see North Staffs University College
Kellmer Pringle, M.L., 193
Kennedy, J.F., 60
Kerr, C., 67–8
Kirp, D.L., 20, 26, 27, 212
Kogan, M., 20, 23, 25–6, 27, 219, 212, 214

Labour government, 88, 102, 117, 128, 133, 157, 195
Labour Party, 81, 90, 190, 201
Lagemann, E.C., 171
land-grant colleges and universities, 60, 61, 67, 152
Lazerson, M., 24, 173
Leeds University, 40, 48, 50
Leicester University, 44
Leslie, B.W., 176, 179
Levin, H., 26
liberal education, 67, 105, 109–10, 112–14, 129–37 *passim*
Liberal Education in a Technical Age, 131–2
liberal studies, 131–4, 136
Lindop Committee (academic validation in higher education, 1985), 46, 47
literacy, 175
Litwack, L.F., 167, 178
Lloyd, S.M., 178
Lock Haven University, 62
London School of Economics, 86, 157, 194
London University, 35–46 *passim*, 51–2, 64, 75, 150, 151, 152, 157
Lowe, R., 184, 204, 219

McBride, P., 27
McDonald, B., 20
Maclure, S., 70, 89–90
McPherson, A., 8, 12, 214, 219
McVicker Hunt, J., 197
Manchester University, 37–40, 42, 45
Mann Bond, H., 183
Manpower Services Commission (MSC), 100, 103, 111, 116–20 *passim*, 129–30, 139
Mansell, J., 119
Massachusetts, University of, 60
Mass Observation, 192
Mattingly, P.H., 178–9
Mays, J.B., 194
Melling, G., 108, 120
Meyer, J.W., 183–4
modular courses, 48, 123, 126–8, 160
Mohl, R.A., 169, 178
monitorial system, 150
Montessori, M., 156, 161
Morris, M., 193
Mortimore, P., 199–200
Moynihan, D.P., 24

Nasaw, D., 171, 174
National Advisory Body (NAB), 34, 47–8, 50, 59, 72, 73–4, 80, 88
National Association for the Promotion of Social Science, 151–2
National Children's Bureau, 194
National Council for Technological Awards (NCTA), 46, 63, 68–9, 75, 113, 131–2
National Council for Vocational Qualifications (NCVQ), 120
National Defense Education Act (1958), 173, 220
National Institute of Adult Education, 131
National Vocational Qualification (NVQ), 127
Nature, 82, 84–5
Nebraska, University of, 60–1
Neill, A.S., 156, 157

Newcastle, 193, 194
New Jersey, 73
Newsom report (*Half Our Future*, 1963), 194
New York State University, 65
New Zealand, University of, 153–4
normal schools, 61–2, 66
North of England Education Conference, 92
North Staffs University College (Keele), 39, 45
Nuffield enquiry (higher education), 48
Nunn, P., 157

Oakes Committee (management of higher education in the maintained sector), 73
Open University, 38, 51, 160
occupational training families (OTFs), 118, 122
Owen, R., 150, 161
Owens College, 37, 152
also see Manchester University
Oxford Polytechnic, 48
Oxford University, 36, 37, 38, 45, 49, 151, 152, 162

Passow, A.H., 15
Patten, C., 130
Pennsylvania, 61–2
Percy, Lord, 44
Peztalozzi, J.H., 149–50
Peterson, P.E., 168, 169, 172, 176, 183, 219
PhD, 39, 156, 157
planned variation, 159
A Plan for Polytechnics and Other Colleges (White Paper, 1966), 68, 87
Plowden Committee (primary education, 1967), 25–6, 158, 159, 194–6, 199, 201
policy analysis, 6, 8, 1930, 69, 172, 211–221 *passim*
policy research, 5–6, 21–7, 216
policy studies, 25, 213, 217–8
Polytechnic of North London (PNL), 92
polytechnics, 46–7, 48, 50, 51, 64, 68–72, 79, 80–3, 87–96 *passim*, 112–14, 160
Polytechnics and Colleges Funding Council (PCFC), 59, 73, 80
positive discrimination, 159, 195, 202
poverty, 13–14, 34, 158–60, 189–206, 217
pre-school education, 158–9, 195, 197, 198, 200
primary education, 25–6, 158–9, 193–6, 199, 201
progressive education, 153, 155–7, 161, 169, 172, 177
Prucha, F.P., 173
psychologists, 20, 155–6, 193
public sector of higher education, 45–7, 58–75, 79–96, 126

quality, 14, 34–52, 67, 80, 154
see also standards

Raab, C.D., 8, 12, 214, 219
race, 26, 135–6, 158–9, 174–82 *passim*, 195, 197, 198, 201
Ravitch, D., 173–4, 180, 219
Reading University, 44
Reece, W.J., 170, 173
Resnick, D.P., 174, 175
Resnick, L., 175
Review of Vocational Qualifications (RVQ), 118–19, 120, 123, 127, 131
revisionist history, 10–11, 21, 29, 168–176 *passim*, 203
Rhodes, E.C., 49
Rickover, H.G., 158
Riesman, D., 67
Rippa, S.A., 181
Rivlin, A.M., 5–6, 211–12
Robbins Committee (higher education, 1963), 25–6, 43, 49, 58–9, 60, 63–4, 75, 79, 81–3, 87, 88, 96, 194
Robbins, Lord, 63, 69, 87
Robinson, E.E., 46–7
Rockefeller Foundation, 157, 171
Rose, R., 216
Rothschild report (government research and development), 27
Rothman, D.J., 170, 173
Royal Society of Arts (RSA), 116, 130–1
Rousseau, J–J, 149–50, 161
Rutter, M., 199

Sadler, Sir M., 48
Salter, B., 8–9, 214, 219
Sarason, S.B., 27

Schools Council, 159, 160
Schultz, S.K., 181
Scotland, 148, 149, 151, 152, 154, 195–6
Scott, P., 88
Scottish Action Plan, 126–7
Select Committee
see student relations
Shapiro, M.S., 169
Sharpe, L.J., 20
Shils, E., 8
Simon, B., 28, 193
Simon of Wythenshawe, Lady, 158
Simon of Wythenshawe, Lord, 82
skills, 100–39 *passim*
Smith, S., 173
Snow, C.P., 85
social and life skills (SLS), 124
social class, 11, 26, 28, 79, 158, 168–82 *passim*, 189–206 *passim*
social control, 11, 135, 169, 170–1, 176, 202, 203, 205, 219
sociologists, 20, 29, 84, 155–6, 157–8, 190–1, 201
Soltow, L., 175
Southampton University, 35–45 *passim*, 48
Spencer, H., 110
Spring J., 172
sputnik, 159, 162, 176
staff appraisal, 49, 93
standards, 35–52, 58–75 *passim*, 79–96 *passim*, 199, 217
also see quality
state colleges and universities, 59–68, 73
Stearns, P.N., 221
Stevens, A., 90, 91
Stevens, E., 175
Stewart, M., 82
Stirling University, 51
streaming, 192, 193, 195
Student Relations (Select Committee report, 1969), 86, 87
Sutherland, G., 28, 215
Sutherland, Sir G., 85
Sweden, 149, 158
Swinnerton-Dyer Committee (London University, 1981), 51

Tapper, T., 8–9, 214, 219
Tawney, R.H., 52, 190
Taylor report (*The Years of Crisis*, 1963), 81
teacher education, 49, 51, 60–72 *passim*, 87–90, 149, 156, 160, 198
Tebbitt, N., 92–3
Technical and Vocational Initiative (TVEI), 111–12
Technical Education (White Paper, 1956), 63, 115, 131–2
Technician Education Council (TEC), 104, 120, 126–8, 132
Thatcher, M., 88, 91
The Times, 81, 91
The Times Higher Education Supplement, 59, 91
The Times Review of Industry and Technology, 82
Title I, 198
also see Elementary and Secondary Education Act
Tolley, G., 106, 110
training, 101–4, 117–37 *passim*
Training Opportunities (TOPS), 104
Trow, M., 20, 23
Twentieth Century, 79
Tyack, D.B., 10, 29–30, 168–9, 173, 174, 177, 178, 180, 181, 184, 212, 215–16, 219, 221

unemployment, 106, 133, 136–7
UNESCO, 160
Unified Vocational Programme (UVP), 104, 117
universities, 35–52 *passim*, 58–75 *passim* 79–96 *passim*
Universities Funding Council (UFC), 80, 94
Universities Quarterly, 88, 89
University College, London, 37, 50, 151
University Grants Committee (UGC), 35, 39–48 *passim*, 63, 71–2, 80, 82, 84
Urban, W.J., 179, 180–1

Vaizey, J., 87
Vickers, Sir G., 27
Victoria University, 39, 41
Vinovskis, M.A., 172, 182
vocationalism, 49, 61, 65–75 *passim*,

82, 87–95 *passim*, 100–41, 171, 176, 199, 217

Wales, 149, 151, 195
Wall, W.D., 193
Walzer, M., 167
War on Poverty, 13, 158–9, 197
Warnock report (*Special Educational Needs*, 1978), 159
Warren, D., 174
Weaver, Sir T., 69, 70
Weir, M., 168, 180, 182, 183, 219
Weiss, C.H., 20, 23, 168
Westfield College, 41
West Virginia Board of Regents, 72–3
White, A.O., 179, 180
Whitehead, A.N., 105
White Papers
see Better Opportunities in Technical Education; *Education: A Framework for Expansion*; *Education and Training for Young People: Technical Education*
Wiener, M.J., 109
Wildavsky, A., 19–20, 23, 27, 30
Wilderspin, S., 150, 161
Wilkins, R., 16
Williams, S., 90
Williams, W.F., 49–50
Wilson, J.Q., 21, 22, 30
Winnicott, D.W., 194
Wolfenden, Sir John, 44
Woolwich Polytechnic, 41
Wrigley, J., 50

Young, E.F., 178
Young, Lord, 111
Youth Opportunities Programme (YOP), 104, 117, 119–20, 129
Youth Training Scheme (YTS), 117, 118, 120–2, 124, 125

Education Policy Perspectives

General Editor: **Professor Ivor Goodson,** Faculty of Education, University of Western Ontario, London, Canada N6G 1G7

PRIVATE SCHOOLS AND PUBLIC POLICY:
International Perspectives
Edited by William Lowe Boyd and James G. Cibulka

EDUCATION POLICIES:
Controversies and Critiques
Edited by Andy Hargreaves and David Reynolds

OUT OF PLACE:
Public Policy and the Emergence of Truancy
Fiona M. S. Paterson

MAKING THE SCHOOL AN EFFECTIVE COMMUNITY:
Belief, Practice and Theory in School Administration
Mark Holmes and Edward A. Wynne

FLUNKING GRADES:
Research and Policies on Retention
Edited by Lorrie A. Shepard and Mary Lee Smith

SUCCESSFUL SECONDARY SCHOOLS:
Visions of Excellence in American Public Education
Bruce L. Wilson and Thomas B. Corcoran

EDUCATIONAL POLICY IN AUSTRALIA AND AMERICA
Comparative Perspectives
Edited by William Lowe Boyd and Don Smart

Education, Change and the Policy Process details the process of policy making, how policy is analyzed, and, particularly, how history may contribute to its understanding. Professor Silver discusses the relationship between history and policy, takes a number of policy issues (the education of disadvantaged children, vocational issues in further and higher education, and educational relationships between Britain and the rest of the world) and analyzes their recent history in order to illustrate the relationship.

This book continues Professor Silver's recent research examining underlying changes in education and formulation and implementation of policy in a comparative history of education in Britain and the United States.

Harold Silver, currently researcher and consultant, is a visiting professor at Oxford Polytechnic and senior project associate at Pennsylvania State University.

Cover design by Caroline Archer

ISBN 1 85000 699 7

BEST COPY AVAILABLE